DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 387 185 JC 950 488

TITLE	Critical Success Factors for the North Carolina Community College System, 1995. Sixth Annual Report.
INSTITUTION	North Carolina State Dept. of Community Colleges, Raleigh.
PUB DATE	May 95
NOTE	126p.; For the 1994 edition, see ED 375 894.
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Education; Accountability; Articulation (Education); *College Outcomes Assessment; Community Colleges; Community Services; Economic Development; *Educational Quality; Labor Force Development; *Organizational Effectiveness; *Outcomes of Education; School Community Relationship; *State Standards; State Surveys; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS	*North Carolina Community College System

ABSTRACT

The data presented in this report are indicators of the level of success of the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) in the 1993-94 academic year as measured by student outcomes and the extent to which the system addresses the needs of the state. Where possible, 5-year data are also presented. Seven critical factors are examined: (1) student success, as measured by number of continuing students; progress of literacy students; number of high school equivalency diplomas awarded compared to the number of state dropouts; performance of transfers after 2 semesters; rate of success on licensure exams; program completion rates; and passing rates for remedial and general education courses; (2) resources, measured by institutional salaries; student/faculty ratio; participation in staff development programs; currentness of equipment; library standards; and system funding for full-time equivalent (FTE) students; (3) access, assessed in terms of enrollment of high school dropouts, handicapped, single parents, nontraditional high school diploma earners, and inmates; numbers served through literacy programs; percentage of students receiving financial aid; and percent of population in service area enrolled; (4) education continuum, evaluated by number and percent of recent high school graduates enrolled; enrollment in cooperative agreements with high schools; tech prep student enrollment; and number and percent of University of North Carolina students who attended a community college; (5) workforce development, evidenced by the number of employers and trainees served; number of workplace literacy sites; employer satisfaction; and graduate employment status; (6) community services, measured in terms of courses offered, senior citizen enrollment, and support of community services; and (7) program management and accountability, assessed by an annual program audit, program reviews, and accredited programs. (KP)

ED 387 185

1995 CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

FOR THE

NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

Sixth Annual Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
K. Brown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

North Carolina Community College System
Planning & Research Section

April 1995

NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

JC 950 488

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1995 CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

FOR THE

NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

Sixth Annual Report

April 1995

Published by

North Carolina Community College System
***Lloyd V. Hackley*, President**

Planning & Research Section
***Keith Brown,* Project Director &**
Coordinator of Institutional Planning

Xiaoyun Yang
Coordinator of Special Projects

Brenda Splawn
Statistical Research Assistant

Vivian Barrett
Office Assistant

NC Community College System • Caswell Building • 200 W. Jones Street • Raleigh, NC 27603-1379
Telephone: 919/733-7051 • Fax: 919/733-0680

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT 2

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS MATRIX 4

FUTURE PROSPECTS 5

FACTOR I: STUDENT SUCCESS 7

Measure A: Number of Students Returning from Previous Quarters 8

Measure B: Progress of Literacy Students 12

Measure C: Number of GEDs and AHSDs Awarded Compared to the Number of Dropouts Statewide 17

Measure D: Performance of Transfers After Two Semesters 20

Measure E: Rate of Success on Licensure Exams 32

Measure F: Program Completion Rates 45

Measure G: Passing Rates for Remedial Courses 47

Measure H: Passing Rates for "General Education" and "Related" Courses 48

FACTOR II: RESOURCES 49

Measure A: Institutional Salaries as a Percent of the Southeastern Regional Average 50

Measure B: Student/Faculty Ratio 55

Measure C: Participation in Staff Development Programs: Tier A 56

Measure D: Currentness of Equipment 59

Measure E: Percent of Libraries Meeting American Library Association Standards 61

Measure F: System Funding/FTE 63

FACTOR III: ACCESS 65

Measure A: Enrollment of High School Dropouts; Handicapped; Disadvantaged; Single Parents; Nontraditional High School Diploma Earners; Inmates 66

Measure B: Number Served by Type Through Literacy Programs and Percent of Target Population Served 71

Measure C: Number and Percent of Dropouts Annually Who are Served by Literacy Programs 75

Measure D: Percent of Students Receiving Financial Aid and Amount of Aid Compared with Cost of Attendance 78

Measure E: Percent of Population in Service Area Enrolled 80

FACTOR IV: EDUCATION CONTINUUM 83

Measure A: Number and Percent of Recent High School Graduates Enrolled in Community College Programs 84

Measure B: Number of and Enrollment in Cooperative Agreements with High Schools 86

Measure C: Percent of Tech Prep Students Enrolling in a Community College 89

Measure D: Number and Percent of Students in the UNC System Who Attended a Community College 90

FACTOR V: WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT 93

Measure A: Number of Employers and Trainees Served by: New and Expanding Industry, Focused Industrial Training, Small Business Centers, Apprenticeship Programs 94

Measure B: Number of Workplace Literacy Sites and Number of Students Being Served 97

Measure C: Employer Satisfaction with Graduates 99

Measure D: Employment Status of Graduates 101

FACTOR VI: COMMUNITY SERVICES 103

Measure A: Number of Courses Offered and Students Enrolled Through Community Services (Avocational, Practical Skills, Academic and Recreational) 104

Measure B: Enrollment of Senior Citizens 106

Measure C: Support of Community Services (Use of Facilities by Outside Groups; Support of Civic and Cultural Activities) 108

FACTOR VII: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT/ACCOUNTABILITY 111

Measure A: Annual Educational Program Audit Summary—Number Audited and Percent of System Instructional Budget Cited for Exceptions 112

Measure B: Number and Percent of Programs Reviewed 115

Measure C: Number and Percent of Eligible Programs Accredited or Reaffirmed 118

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS FOR THE NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

Sixth Annual Report
April, 1995

INTRODUCTION

This sixth annual report on the critical success factors for the North Carolina Community College System is one of several system accountability tools. The data presented in this report are indicators of the health of the system, the extent to which the system is addressing the needs of the state, and the success of the system as measured by student outcomes. Where possible, data covering a five year period have been presented in order to indicate trends relative to the measures.

The original intent of the critical success factors report was to present data that would measure the performance of the system. As the years have progressed, however, the report has been modified to include institutional data on certain measures. In presenting institutional data, no attempt has been made to rank colleges relative to performance on measures due to the differences in the nature of the colleges and the quality of the data currently being collected. Instead, in presenting institutional data, the colleges have been grouped according to total full time equivalent students (FTE) and listed within each group in ascending order by FTE.

In 1993 the General Assembly passed a special provision on accountability. The special provision mandated that the State Board of Community Colleges review the critical success factors and measures for the purpose of establishing performance standards for those measures that would indicate colleges' progress in addressing system goals. An accountability task force was established during the summer of 1993 and began the process of reviewing the critical success factors and measures and establishing performance standards. Performance standards for certain critical success factors measures have been adopted. During 1994-95, the appropriateness of the standards will be tested. Reporting on the standards will begin with the 1995-96 critical success factors report.

Over the years, experience with the critical success factors and their measures, as well as modifications in the factors and measures, has resulted in improved data collection and reporting. While improvements have been made, there still remain some problem areas. Emphasis will continue to be placed on developing standard definitions for certain measures and for insuring the systematic collection of data by all colleges.

As in previous years, a description of a factor is provided at the beginning of each section of the report. In presenting the data for each of the measures, background information on the measure is provided along with the methodology of data collection. Following the data, recommendations for improvements to the measure or for further analysis are given.

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT

Critical success factors have been defined as "the key things that must go right for an enterprise (in this case, the North Carolina Community College System) to flourish and achieve its goals." The concept of critical success factors was developed at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Sloan School of Business for application in a business setting, but it is applicable to any organization. The effort to identify these "key things" enables the organization to focus its efforts. Thinking through appropriate measures for the factors insures that the organization will examine its performance. Thus, critical success factors are both a planning and an evaluation/accountability tool.

USES FOR CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

- **Accountability**
- **Development of Strategic Goals**
- **Improvement of Programs and Administration**

Measurements of the attainment of critical success factors are an important part of the accountability system in use in the community college system. A number of tools are in place and in use by the State Board. The colleges are required to conduct a planning process which includes goal-setting and evaluation of progress toward those goals. Other accountability mechanisms include curriculum standards, review of institutional plans and programs, program and financial audits, program monitoring and accreditation. Other tools are being developed, including the student progress monitoring system (which will also support development of better critical success factors).

In its 1989 session, the North Carolina General Assembly adopted a provision (S.L.1989; C. 752; S. 80) which mandated that:

> "The State Board of Community Colleges shall develop a 'Critical Success Factors' list to define statewide measures of accountability for all community colleges. Each college shall develop an institutional effectiveness plan, tailored to the specific mission of the college. This plan shall be consistent with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools criteria and provide for collection of data as required by the 'Critical Success Factors' list."

The colleges, in turn, were granted a greater degree of flexibility in deciding how to use their state funds.

This special provision is neither the first nor the last state initiative linking flexibility in the use of funds with required accountability measures. Its requirements leave in the hands of the State Board and the colleges the identification of the key factors that will be measured and the specific approach that will be taken to measure them. The measurement of these factors provides a way of showing how well the system is doing its job as assigned by law and how well the system is addressing the goals set by the State Board of Community Colleges.

The critical success factors were developed by the State Board to measure the system, not individual colleges. The state totals and averages do provide a benchmark for the colleges to measure their efforts and institutional data on selected measures are presented in this report. Still, the critical success factors compiled for assessing the performance of the system will not be exactly suitable for measurement of any institution. For example, the percent of students in the University of North Carolina system who attended a community college is a measure that helps system leaders evaluate our system's progress over time and compare our system with others, but it cannot be meaningfully calculated for individual institutions. Especially in these times when budgets are very tight, the performance of individual colleges on measures such as currentness of equipment and meeting Association of College and Research Libraries standards may reflect the results of hard choices made by individual administrators, and not be inherently any better than the choice made by another institution.

Some measures are so important to any real attempt to assess success that their absence compromises the result. Yet, some of these measures are not possible within the present capacity of the system to measure. In the initial year, a commitment was made that since resources for data collection at the campus level are already strained, no measures requiring additional surveys or data collection at the college level would be selected. This year we have surveyed the colleges for a small amount of data, and we have made some improvements in the collection of data at the state level which enable us to provide new and more in-depth information on some factors.

There remain some measures which are essential to a meaningful report, yet are beyond our capacity. The most essential of these is persistence of students toward goals, which is a key component of the Student Progress Monitoring System currently being implemented. Other outcomes being developed are related to employer satisfaction with graduates and the success of the Small Business Centers.

This report includes background information explaining why each measure was chosen, what it is intended to show and the limitations of the data. The data and sources of the data, a brief assessment of the implications of the data and recommendations for future changes in the measures are given. Where appropriate, institutional data are presented on selected measures. Recommendations for program changes indicated by the data are outside the scope of this report.

The critical success factors were originally adopted by the State Board of Community Colleges in July 1989 and amended in September 1990, September 1991, and in September 1992. North Carolina has adopted the matrix format of the National Alliance of Community and Technical Colleges to graphically display the set of factors chosen. The matrix showing the factors and measures is on page 5.

North Carolina Community College System
CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS AND MEASURES OF QUALITY, 1994-95

FACTOR I Student Success	A. Number of students returning from previous quarters	B. Progress of literacy students	C. Number of GED's and AHSD's awarded compared to the number of dropouts statewide	D. Performance of transfers after two semesters	E. Rate of success on licensure exams (where such are required)	F. *Program completion rates*	G. *Passing rates for remedial courses*	H. *Passing rates for "General Education" and "related" courses*
FACTOR II Resources	A. Average salaries as a percent of the Southeastern regional average	B. *Student/faculty ratio*	C. *Participation in staff development programs: Tier A*	D. Currentness of equipment	E. Percent of libraries meeting ALA* standards	F. System Funding/FTE		
FACTOR III Access	A. Enrollment of high school dropouts; handicapped; disadvantaged; single parents; nontraditional high school diploma earners; inmates	B. Number served by type through literacy programs and percent of target population served	C. Number & percent of dropouts annually served by literacy programs	D. Percent of students receiving financial aid and amount of aid compared with *cost of attendance*	E. Percent of population in service area enrolled			
FACTOR IV Education Continuum	A. Number & percent of recent high school graduates enrolled in community college programs	B. Number of & enrollment in cooperative agreements with high school	C. *Percent of Tech Prep students enrolling in a community college*	D. Number & percent of students in the UNC system who attended a community college				
FACTOR V Workforce Development	A. Number of employers and trainees served by: New & Expanding Industry, FIT, Small Business Centers, Apprenticeship programs	B. Number of workplace literacy sites and number of students being served	C. *Employer satisfaction with graduates*	D. *Employment status of graduates*				
FACTOR VI Community Services	A. Number of courses offered & students enrolled through community services (avocational, practical skills, academic, and recreational)	B. Enrollment of senior citizens	C. Support of community service activities (use of facilities by outside groups; support of civic and cultural activities)					
FACTOR VII Program Management/ Accountability	A. Annual educational program audit summary--number audited & percent of system instructional budget cited for exceptions	B. Number and percent of programs reviewed	C. Number and percent of eligible programs accredited or reaffirmed					

*American Library Association

NOTE: Measures in italics are being developed for future reporting.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FUTURE PROSPECTS

The development of the critical success factors will aid the State Board of Community Colleges in setting strategic goals for the system. By indicating how the system has performed and is performing currently in key areas, the factors will provide a foundation for adopting reasonable targets for future efforts.

The critical success factors for the system provide a model for the individual institutions. The National Alliance Model, which includes a process for developing, validating and revising the chart, is recommended for developing critical success factors relevant to each college's own goals and mission.

Progress has been made in identifying measures that indicate educational outcomes for students. The development of the Student Success factor is a clear example of the emphasis being put on the development of performance measures. As our experience with these measures increases, additional performance measures will be developed and analyzed. The focus will be on developing factors and measures that reflect the mission of the community college system in North Carolina.

It is to the interest of the system that the critical success factors provide useful and relevant data to the public, the governing boards and the general assembly. They will reveal ways in which the system can improve and progress, and the leadership of the system can use them for positive change.

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR I: STUDENT SUCCESS

Increasingly, educational institutions are being called upon to support and document educational accomplishments. This call for accountability is coming from the federal government, state legislatures, and accrediting agencies. No longer can education institutions focus solely on the processes of education or on the number of students being served. There is a public demand today for an accounting for public funds spent on education. Put simply, the public, through government bodies and accreditation agencies, is demanding to know what kind of return is being generated by the investment of public dollars in education.

Community colleges are operating under several new mandates relative to measuring student success. The reauthorized Carl Perkins Act requires states to establish standards of performance for students being served with Perkins funds. The federal Right to Know legislation requires colleges and universities to inform prospective students of graduation rates at the institution. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), the accrediting agency for colleges in the southeast, has, for several years, required colleges to develop and implement an institutional effectiveness process involving planning and the assessment of expected educational results. The State Board of Community Colleges requires institutions to submit annual institutional effectiveness plans to the North Carolina Community College System Office that include the identification of expected educational outcomes. Beginning in 1994-95, the State Board of Community Colleges requires institutions to review all curriculum programs and services annually using a standard Annual Program Audit. Finally, the State Board of Community Colleges adopted performance standards for colleges on those critical success factors and measures that indicate colleges' performance relative to system goals. These standards will become effective in 1995-96.

The call for accountability renews the focus on students and student success. The identification of the appropriate measures of student success for community college students is not an easy task. Unlike traditional university students, the majority of whom are in pursuit of a degree, community college students attend for a wide variety of reasons including pursuit of a degree, transfer to a four-year institution, upgrading job skills, and attainment of basic literacy skills. Though progress has been made in the identification of some key student success measures, continued efforts in this area need to be undertaken.

The measures for "Student Success" adopted by the State Board of Community Colleges are:

A. Number of Students Returning from Previous Quarters
B. Progress of Literacy Students
C. Number of GEDs and AHSDs Awarded Compared to the Number of Dropouts Statewide
D. Performance of Transfers After Two Semesters
E. Rate of Success on Licensure Exams (where such are required)
F. Program Completion Rates
G. Passing Rates for Remedial Courses
H. Passing Rates for "General Education" and "related" courses

STUDENT SUCCESS MEASURE A: ***Number of Students Returning from Previous Quarters***

Background

Although there are many reasons why students cannot attend classes in any one quarter, or why they drop out altogether, the quality of the program is one of those reasons. Students who continue studies from quarter to quarter show commitment to a program and progress toward completion. A report on retention in the community college system was conducted in 1987 (Lincoln and Smith, 1987). That study is a more extensive discussion of retention issues.

The current definition of retention used in this report focuses on the percent of curriculum students who enroll in fall quarter and subsequently enroll in either winter or spring quarter. Specifically, using curriculum enrollment data, the proportion of students who enrolled in fall quarter, did not complete their program in fall quarter, and subsequently enrolled in winter and/or spring quarter of the same year was calculated. Special studies students (non-credit), co-op students, and dual enrollment students were omitted from the analysis.

Beginning in 1991-92 a new data field was added to the Curriculum Student Progress Information System (CSPIS) to capture student intent. Student intent was classified into six codes to indicate why a student was enrolled at the institution. It was felt that, by knowing student intent, a more accurate retention figure could be calculated. A separate analysis of those students indicating degree, diploma, or certificate intent is provided.

Implications

The retention rate for community colleges has continued to increase over the past five years. The reason for the marked increase in the retention rate in 1993-94 is not known at this time. It is interesting to note that during 1993-94, overall enrollment in curriculum programs showed a small decline. Speculation is that, with a stronger economy in 1993-94, more people were working which affected enrollment in community college programs. A possible explanation for the increased retention rate is that individuals who might normally attend some short training for increased job skills did not enroll in 1993-94 (thus accounting for the decline in overall enrollment) and those who did enroll were more likely to be students seeking more extensive training.

A second plausible reason for the increased retention rate is that in 1993-94, the date at which a student was counted as officially registered was moved from the 20 percent date to the 30 percent date. It is highly probable that this move in the "counting" date accounts for some of the decline in enrollment and in the increase in retention since those students who dropped out between the 20 percent date and 30 percent date were no longer counted as enrolled in the fall. More analysis of college data will be necessary to determine the extent to which the changing of the reporting date affected student retention.

As expected, the retention rate for students seeking a degree, diploma, or certificate was higher than was the retention rate for enrolled students in general.

Data

PROPORTION OF FALL CURRICULUM STUDENTS WHO SUBSEQUENTLY ENROLL IN THE WINTER AND/OR SPRING QUARTER OF THE SAME ACADEMIC YEAR

YEAR	% RE-ENROLL TOTAL	% RE-ENROLL DEGREE SEEKING
1989-90	67.6	N/A
1990-91	74.9	N/A
1991-92	79.4	79.5
1992-93	78.1	N/A
1993-94	85.6	90.1

Source: Planning and Research, NC Community College System Office.

Recommendation

The current definition of retention should be re-examined. Rather than focusing on retention within a given year, it may prove more insightful to focus on retention from one year to the next. This definition would be in line with the federal Right to Know legislation which requires the reporting on student progress toward graduation.

A more comprehensive examination of student enrollment data should be conducted as resources permit. Factors which might affect retention should be examined. Information on retention rates for other community college systems should be collected. In addition, a long term analysis of student enrollment patterns should be undertaken to more effectively determine when students drop out rather than simply "stop out."

FALL CURRICULUM STUDENTS WHO SUBSEQUENTLY ENROLL IN THE WINTER AND/OR SPRING QUARTER OF THE SAME ACADEMIC YEAR, 1993-94

INSTITUTION	FTE	% ALL CURR. STUDENTS	% DEGREE SEEKING ONLY
<1,000			
Pamlico CC	182	92.8	98.6
Montgomery CC	662	75.9	82.8
Tri-County CC	669	83.6	91.4
Bladen CC	672	82.1	92.0
McDowell TCC	772	81.2	89.5
Martin CC	928	91.8	93.9
Brunswick CC	949	89.9	92.4
Anson CC	951	80.0	92.2
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960	96.5	98.4
1,000-1,999			
Mayland CC	1,033	92.6	95.9
James Sprunt CC	1,124	68.0	73.0
Sampson CC	1,268	92.5	95.5
Piedmont CC	1,278	80.7	94.1
Carteret CC	1,289	88.9	99.5
Haywood CC	1,359	97.8	95.2
Nash CC	1,390	89.5	92.9
Wilson TCC	1,405	87.3	87.7
Mitchell CC	1,406	88.5	92.9
Cleveland CC	1,464	84.7	86.4
Halifax CC	1,473	95.5	99.1
Isothermal CC	1,495	81.1	83.5
Southwestern CC	1,495	95.9	95.6
Blue Ridge CC	1,500	84.0	88.1
College of The Albemarle	1,504	82.9	89.9
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	78.1	82.6
Stanly CC	1,517	91.6	90.7
Richmond CC	1,522	86.7	90.3
Randolph CC	1,624	93.2	95.9
Edgecombe CC	1,647	81.0	85.5
Rockingham CC	1,670	90.7	91.5
Southeastern CC	1,717	89.5	92.6
Wilkes CC	1,740	93.1	97.2
Robeson CC	1,794	88.5	96.8
Craven CC	1,980	86.5	89.0
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	87.6	92.0
2,000-2,999			
Lenoir CC	2,161	84.9	86.3
Davidson Co. CC	2,165	94.6	96.4
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	79.0	80.5
Surry CC	2,342	89.3	97.3
Alamance CC	2,522	90.3	95.4
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	89.1	90.4
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	73.1	90.8
Wayne CC	2,680	90.8	84.3
Johnston CC	2,706	84.3	84.9
Sandhills CC	2,839	94.8	98.6
Catawba Valley CC	2,948	84.1	86.5
3,000-4,999			
Central Carolina CC	3,062	80.4	92.9
Cape Fear CC	3,080	80.7	86.5
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	81.3	81.8
Durham TCC	3,170	85.5	87.1
Pitt CC	3,260	87.4	98.8
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	92.9	96.1
Gaston CC	3,588	85.9	88.9
Forsyth TCC	4,099	97.4	92.3
>4,999			
Guilford TCC	5,366	83.2	88.3
Wake TCC	5,732	85.7	94.6
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	77.9	82.7
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	80.4	86.5
System	129,877	85.6	90.1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Background

The State Board of Community Colleges adopted four goals in September, 1994 that set the priorities of the System. Included in these goals were: upgrading training and retraining ("world-class workforce"); and eliminating illiteracy. If North Carolina is to have a competitive workforce, then individuals must be equipped, at the minimum, with basic skills. The efforts undertaken by the community college system in the area of literacy are critical to the future of the state.

In literacy programs, as in all community college programs, the number of people who complete a program is not a real indicator of the education being provided. Since it is not a compulsory system, people are free to come and go as their life circumstances or interests motivate them. However, they may benefit greatly from the classes they do attend and complete. Many of the people who most need literacy classes have not experienced success in school and have fears to overcome before they are willing to attend regularly. Moving from illiteracy to a high school level education is a long and arduous process that takes a great deal of commitment.

In literacy programs, students are often pressured by lack of money, other demands on their time, and by other barriers to continuing their educations. In spite of the barriers, many adults do enroll for long enough periods of time to raise grade level abilities in reading, math, and other skills, but still do not complete the entire program. With the testing programs put in place in the last few years and with the student progress monitoring system, these gains will be measurable and will indicate real impacts of the literacy programs.

Two indicators of the progress of literacy students were examined. First, data on the progression of students through the literacy programs were collected and analyzed. Using the Literacy Education Information System data, information was compiled on the percent of students who entered a level of literacy and exited the program during the same year without completing the level entered; who are still persisting in the level of literacy entered; who completed the level of literacy entered and exited the program; and who completed the level entered and advanced to the next level of literacy.

The indicator discussed above measures the progress of literacy students through the literacy program. Literacy, however, is really the beginning rather than the end of a student's training for today's workplace. A second indicator of the progress of literacy students is an analysis of the number of students with an Adult High School Diploma (AHSD) or a GED who enter a curriculum or occupational extension program at the college. This indicator is a measure of success for the student in gaining additional training and for the system and colleges in providing a continuum of programs.

To determine the number of students with an AHSD or GED enrolled in the system, an analysis of the annual curriculum registration and extension registration data tapes was conducted. In previous years, these data files indicated if a student had a GED, but did not distinguish between an AHSD and a regular high school diploma. In 1991-92, however, a separate code was given to students with an AHSD, thus allowing for this analysis.

Implications

The data indicate a slight decrease in the percent of literacy students who exit a program prior to completion, as well as a slight increase in the percent of literacy students who progress to the next level of literacy. Overall it can be said that 75 percent of the students enrolled in literacy programs in 1993-94 are either progressing or have completed their program of study. Of the 25 percent who exited without completion, it is not known whether they are "stop outs," have completed their personal goals for entering the literacy program, or have truly dropped out of the program. A more extensive study would be necessary to determine why students exited without completing the level they entered.

The data on the number of students with an AHSD or a GED enrolled in a curriculum program or an occupational extension program demonstrates the large number of non-traditional students the colleges are serving. In 1993-94 a total of 57,751 students with an AHSD or a GED enrolled in a curriculum or occupational extension program. With only three year's data on this indicator, it is not possible to make a judgment on the level of participation by these students; but the numbers do indicate that the system is serving a large number of students who have not been successful in traditional educational programs.

Data

PERCENTAGE OF LITERACY STUDENTS WHO PROGRESS TO ANOTHER LEVEL OF LITERACY

YEAR	EXIT, NON-COMPLETER	PROGRESSING—SAME LEVEL	EXIT, COMPLETER	ADVANCED NEXT LEVEL
1989-90	26	48	16	10
1990-91	23	63	10	4
1991-92	23	59	12	6
1992-93	26	56	10	8
1993-94	25	56	9	10

Source: ***Annual Literacy Report, Student Development Services, NC Community College System Office.***

NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH A GED OR AHSD ENROLLED IN A CURRICULUM PROGRAM OR IN OCCUPATIONAL EXTENSION

YEAR	CURRICULUM		OCCUPATIONAL EXTENSION	
	GED	AHSD	GED	AHSD
1991-92	17,260	16,397	8,595	20,901
1992-93	18,710	13,847	9,805	18,219
1993-94	19,986	11,724	9,479	16,562

Source: ***Planning and Research, NC Community College System Office.***

Recommendation

Refinements in the analysis of data provided by the LEIS should continue. A system has been developed for 1995-96 to determine the level of literacy achieved by completers who exited the program as well as the personal goal accomplishment of students who exit without completing the level of literacy which they entered. A long term study should be designed to determine if students who exit the literacy program without completing their level of study re-enroll at some future date.

Data on the enrollment of students with an AHSD or a GED should continue to be examined. Colleges that have not incorporated the new coding scheme for AHSD should incorporate it in the registration process. Efforts should be undertaken to match these data with the data on students who earn an AHSD or a GED at each college in order to develop a measure of the percent of students who move from literacy to some other college program.

PERCENTAGE OF LITERACY STUDENTS WHO PROGRESS TO ANOTHER LEVEL, 1993-94

INSTITUTION	FTE	EXIT NON-COMPLETER	PROGRESSING SAME LEVEL	EXIT COMPLETER	ADVANCED NEXT LEVEL
<1,000					
Pamlico CC	182	22	71	3	4
Montgomery CC	662	40	48	9	4
Tri-County CC	669	21	70	0	9
Bladen CC	672	14	70	6	10
McDowell TCC	772	20	57	9	13
Martin CC	928	29	55	4	12
Brunswick CC	949	10	69	9	12
Anson CC	951	41	40	5	14
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960	21	71	3	5
1,000-1,999					
Mayland CC	1,033	10	58	7	24
James Sprunt CC	1,124	33	50	5	12
Sampson CC	1,268	41	43	9	7
Piedmont CC	1,278	50	31	7	12
Carteret CC	1,289	29	58	9	4
Haywood CC	1,359	39	42	11	8
Nash CC	1,390	43	40	9	8
Wilson TCC	1,405	35	50	4	12
Mitchell CC	1,406	10	68	4	18
Cleveland CC	1,464	7	77	9	7
Halifax CC	1,473	24	50	5	20
Isothermal CC	1,495	14	65	14	8
Southwestern CC	1,495	30	46	18	6
Blue Ridge CC	1,500	28	45	15	12
College of The Albemarle	1,504	29	43	10	17
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	27	46	22	5
Stanly CC	1,517	38	45	8	9
Richmond CC	1,522	7	69	7	16
Randolph CC	1,624	41	39	11	9
Edgecombe CC	1,647	7	85	6	2
Rockingham CC	1,670	21	49	8	21
Southeastern CC	1,717	32	49	9	10
Wilkes CC	1,740	17	64	5	13
Robeson CC	1,794	36	43	7	13
Craven CC	1,980	23	50	15	12
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	34	45	13	8
2,000-2,999					
Lenoir CC	2,161	23	61	7	9
Davidson Co. CC	2,165	34	42	14	10
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	33	39	10	18
Surry CC	2,342	28	49	10	12
Alamance CC	2,522	19	59	11	11
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	32	47	10	11
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	9	77	6	6
Wayne CC	2,680	25	62	10	3
Johnston CC	2,706	12	72	11	5
Sandhills CC	2,839	35	47	8	9
Catawba Valley CC	2,948	23	59	9	9
3,000-4,999					
Central Carolina CC	3,062	33	48	6	13
Cape Fear CC	3,080	42	43	7	8
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	36	48	8	8
Durham TCC	3,170	6	83	6	5
Pitt CC	3,260	16	80	1	3
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	22	51	13	14
Gaston CC	3,588	23	59	5	14
Forsyth TCC	4,099	58	21	13	8
>4,999					
Guilford TCC	5,366	6	70	6	18
Wake TCC	5,732	26	59	6	9
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	31	53	8	9
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	11	72	3	14
System	129,877	25	56	9	10

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH A GED OR AHSD ENROLLED IN A CURRICULUM PROGRAM OR IN OCCUPATIONAL EXTENSION, 1993-94

INSTITUTION	FTE	CURRICULUM		OCCUPATIONAL EXT.	
		GED	AHSD	GED	AHSD
<1,000					
Pamlico CC	182	38	1	43	41
Montgomery CC	662	209	44	77	30
Tri-County CC	669	236	92	76	44
Bladen CC	672	129	42	65	22
McDowell TCC	772	242	13	27	126
Martin CC	928	163	79	60	62
Brunswick CC	949	152	133	53	90
Anson CC	951	306	62	204	121
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960	99	93	1	61
1,000-1,999					
Mayland CC	1,033	259	28	80	154
James Sprunt CC	1,124	225	31	84	56
Sampson CC	1,268	203	108	123	72
Piedmont CC	1,278	259	100	2	160
Carteret CC	1,289	208	102	192	307
Haywood CC	1,359	209	48	94	75
Nash CC	1,390	311	85	207	136
Wilson TCC	1,405	282	205	0	381
Mitchell CC	1,406	291	81	117	300
Cleveland CC	1,464	118	52	100	200
Halifax CC	1,473	406	30	387	90
Isothermal CC	1,495	0	227	0	153
Southwestern CC	1,495	321	209	209	232
Blue Ridge CC	1,500	2	57	201	274
College of The Albemarle	1,504	19	117	199	24
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	65	33	108	227
Stanly CC	1,517	312	153	219	320
Richmond CC	1,522	87	242	107	167
Randolph CC	1,624	287	49	90	377
Edgecombe CC	1,647	360	156	1	119
Rockingham CC	1,670	227	175	25	131
Southeastern CC	1,717	215	87	56	106
Wilkes CC	1,740	195	82	224	120
Robeson CC	1,794	114	127	59	1,666
Craven CC	1,980	501	134	212	383
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	473	178	200	156
2,000-2,999					
Lenoir CC	2,161	559	223	12	245
Davidson Co. CC	2,165	282	80	434	224
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	404	348	313	160
Surry CC	2,342	256	216	85	160
Alamance CC	2,522	640	77	156	123
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	633	114	20	390
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	482	483	0	660
Wayne CC	2,680	252	265	81	204
Johnston CC	2,706	444	180	0	373
Sandhills CC	2,839	339	98	29	415
Catawba Valley CC	2,948	622	322	289	592
3,000-4,999					
Central Carolina CC	3,062	484	201	228	436
Cape Fear CC	3,080	542	46	161	513
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	716	203	238	370
Durham TCC	3,170	226	906	516	520
Pitt CC	3,260	640	230	2	247
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	504	113	1	455
Gaston CC	3,588	750	693	536	727
Forsyth TCC	4,099	422	1,054	10	735
>4,999					
Guilford TCC	5,366	0	891	0	816
Wake TCC	5,732	810	554	744	409
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	804	738	1,000	727
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	1,652	234	722	78
System	129,877	19,986	11,724	9,479	16,562

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STUDENT SUCCESS MEASURE C: *Number of GEDs and AHSDs Awarded Compared to the Number of Dropouts Statewide*

Background

The great majority of people in North Carolina's workforce are people who are well past high school age. Reducing the numbers of dropouts will result in raising the educational levels of the workforce, but only gradually. If the educational levels of the workforce are to be significantly affected in the short run, more mature people will also have to be attracted back into educational programs.

This measure reflects the net impact of GED/AHSD programs on the percent of the population without high school credentials. It does not show how many of last year's (or any year's) dropouts came back to get a diploma in a community college. (That is the intent of Access Measure C.) This measure shows how many people of whatever ages come back to get their diplomas compared to the number of dropouts in any given year. The number of adults without these credentials is reduced only in two other ways: by their dying or moving out of North Carolina.

Ideally, we would like to see the numbers of dropouts continue to go down at the same time that the numbers of GEDs and AHSDs are raised. That would be attacking the problem at both ends!

There are problems in the collection of data. For example, students who go directly out of high school to an AHSD or GED program are frequently counted as transfers, not dropouts, thus preventing a true measure of the number of students who leave high school without graduating. A comprehensive study of student flow is needed to completely understand this problem.

Implications

From 1989-90 to 1991-92 there was a steady decline in the number of new dropouts added to the dropout pool, while, at the same time, the number of GED/AHSDs awarded increased. In 1991-92 the number of GEDs and AHSDs awarded exceeded the number of new dropouts added to the dropout pool. This was due to the decrease in the number of dropouts reported by the Department of Public Instruction and an increase in the number of GEDs and AHSDs awarded. The net increase in the dropout pool from these two factors was -593.

In 1992-93 the number of public school dropouts increased and the number of GEDs and AHSDs awarded decreased, resulting in an increase in the dropout pool in North Carolina. There has been some speculation that the increase in the number of public school dropouts was due, in part, to increased high school graduation requirements. In 1993-94 there was a slight decline in the number of public school dropouts and a small increase in the number of GEDs and AHSDs awarded by community colleges.

Again it should be emphasized that the number of dropouts reported by the Department of Public Instruction does not include students who did not complete high school and who transferred to a community college. It is likely that some portion of the GEDs and AHSDs awarded in any given year were awarded to these individuals and thus the impact on the increase in the dropout pool may be overestimated.

Data

NUMBER OF GEDs AND AHSDs AWARDED COMPARED TO THE NUMBER OF DROPOUTS STATEWIDE

YEAR	NEW DROPOUTS ADDED TO DROPOUT POOL	GED/AHS DIPLOMAS AWARDED	INCREASE IN DROPOUT POOL
1989-90	23,000	15,013	7,987
1990-91	19,417	16,606	2,811
1991-92	17,190	17,785	-593
1992-93	17,639	16,512	1,127
1993-94	17,371	16,528	1,003

Source: ***GED/AHS Files, NC Community College System Office.***
Dropout Records, NC Department of Public Instruction.

Recommendation

Data on the number of dropouts and the number of GEDs and AHSDs awarded provide a good measure of the success of the educational institutions in North Carolina in increasing the educational attainment of its citizens. To fully understand the success of the system, however, efforts should be made to gather data on the number of students who transfer to community colleges without completing high school in order to accurately determine the impact of the system on the dropout pool.

NUMBER OF GEDs/AHSDs AWARDED, 1993-94

INSTITUTION	FTE	GED	AHS
<1,000			
Pamlico CC	182	32	
Montgomery CC	662	73	
Tri-County CC	669	142	
Bladen CC	672	66	7
McDowell TCC	772	166	
Martin CC	928	55	6
Brunswick CC	949	118	
Anson CC	951	116	
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960	94	
1,000-1,999			
Mayland CC	1,033	223	
James Sprunt CC	1,124	83	6
Sampson CC	1,268	122	6
Piedmont CC	1,278	217	14
Carteret CC	1,289	124	17
Haywood CC	1,359	114	
Nash CC	1,390	155	80
Wilson TCC	1,405	97	17
Mitchell CC	1,406	243	19
Cleveland CC	1,464	140	144
Halifax CC	1,473	134	
Isothermal CC	1,495	88	178
Southwestern CC	1,495	295	
Blue Ridge CC	1,500	363	
College of The Albemarle	1,504	332	22
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	93	
Stanly CC	1,517	105	59
Richmond CC	1,522	430	46
Randolph CC	1,624	302	22
Edgecombe CC	1,647	266	27
Rockingham CC	1,670	124	0
Southeastern CC	1,717	96	65
Wilkes CC	1,740	94	46
Robeson CC	1,794	22	247
Craven CC	1,980	262	32
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	371	27
2,000-2,999			
Lenoir CC	2,161	216	21
Davidson Co. CC	2,165	206	129
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	221	128
Surry CC	2,342	170	
Alamance CC	2,522	347	17
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	343	1
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	256	253
Wayne CC	2,680	58	178
Johnston CC	2,706	77	95
Sandhills CC	2,839	323	
Catawba Valley CC	2,948	311	
3,000-4,999			
Central Carolina CC	3,062	401	134
Cape Fear CC	3,080	266	85
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	603	
Durham TCC	3,170	60	209
Pitt CC	3,260	246	0
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	340	26
Gaston CC	3,588	605	154
Forsyth TCC	4,099	398	106
>4,999			
Guilford TCC	5,366	365	142
Wake TCC	5,732	481	44
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	490	197
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	483	197
Anson/Stanly Arrangement	--	161	--
St. Andrews College	--	129	--
State GED Office	--	921	332
System	129,877	13,325	3,203

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STUDENT SUCCESS MEASURE D: Performance of Transfers After Two Semesters

Background

The primary aim of community college transfer programs is to provide educational experiences that will enable transfer students to make the transition to a baccalaureate program and perform as well as the students who start out at the receiving institution.

Technical and vocational programs are not designed to qualify students for transfer. However, programs such as Associate Degree Nursing and Engineering Technology allow students to concentrate on practical courses in the first two years and to complete the complementary portion of their programs later. Often, this enables the student to work in the field while getting his or her baccalaureate. It also may accommodate students who do not think they want to get a baccalaureate until after they have had some success in the early portion of the program. This type of program is likely to become more popular, especially as more working adults decide they want a baccalaureate.

The data on academic standing are available only for students who first enrolled at the university during the summer or fall semester. This may exclude many community college transfers. Colleges which do not offer college transfer programs often transfer students with certain technical and/or general education credits. These colleges may also be involved in a contractual program in which a senior college provides general education programs to the community college students. The data are reported separately for students who transferred from community colleges with an approved college transfer program and from those without.

Performance data on students who transfer to a four year institution are provided by the University of North Carolina-General Administration and include only those students who transferred to one of the 16 constituent institutions of the UNC system. No data are available from the private colleges and universities in North Carolina. In addition, the data traditionally reported are for any student who transferred to a UNC institution, regardless of the program from which they transferred or the number of hours taken at the community college.

Recently, through cooperation between UNC-General Administration and the community college system, new data have been made available on the GPA of students who transfer to a UNC institution. These data are analyzed separately based on the student's area of study (college transfer, general education, technical/vocational) and the number of hours completed at the community college prior to transfer. These data will continue to be provided to community colleges by UNC-General Administration which should assist the colleges in the continuous improvement of their programs.

Implications

The data show that after two semesters community college students perform very well as measured both by academic standing and GPA. It should be noted that since the data are for performance after two semesters and most transfers still need at least four semesters to graduate, few can have been expected to appear as graduates in this data.

The data also show an increase in the number of transfers from community colleges offering a pre-baccalaureate program and a corresponding decrease from community colleges not offering the pre-baccalaureate program. This reflects the impact of some colleges offering the pre-baccalaureate program in 1993-94 that had not offered it in previous years.

The data on community college transfers who complete more than 18 hours at a community college indicates that these students are successful after transfer. Caution should be exercised when examining the data, for there are many factors which are still not understood. For example, a cursory look at the data will indicate that students who complete 18-45 quarter hours at a community college have a higher GPA after two semesters at a four year institution than students who complete 90 or more quarter hours prior to transfer. The reason for this is not understood, but one hypothesis is that students who transfer with fewer quarter hours were more certain at the beginning of their program that they were going to transfer or perhaps these students were more successful in previous courses. Only further study and analysis will be able to shed light on these results.

Data

ACADEMIC STANDING OF TRANSFER STUDENTS FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGES OFFERING PRE-BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS, AFTER TWO SEMESTERS, END OF YEAR MEASURES

		PERCENT OF STUDENTS* WHOSE STANDING IS:				
YEAR	NUMBER	GOOD	PROBATION	SUSPEND.	WITHDREW	GRAD.
1989-90	2,326	78.5	8.4	3.7	8.6	0.8
1990-91	2,573	80.6	6.6	5.1	7.2	0.4
1991-92	3,153	75.5	10.2	5.7	7.9	0.7
1992-93	3,647	76.0	9.9	5.6	7.9	0.6
1993-94	3,928	75.7	8.2	7.2	8.4	0.5

ACADEMIC STANDING OF TRANSFER STUDENTS FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGES NOT OFFERING PRE-BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS, AFTER TWO SEMESTERS, END OF YEAR MEASURES

		PERCENT OF STUDENTS* WHOSE STANDING IS:				
YEAR	NUMBER	GOOD	PROBATION	SUSPEND.	WITHDREW	GRAD.
1989-90	536	76.9	6.2	7.1	9.9	0.0
1990-91	615	78.4	4.4	5.4	11.9	0.0
1991-92	880	77.5	5.1	7.7	9.5	0.1
1992-93	375	80.0	6.1	4.5	8.8	0.5
1993-94	336	77.4	3.0	6.8	11.9	0.9

* Numbers do not add to 100 percent due to rounding.

TRANSFERS' FALL AND END OF YEAR GPA, COMMUNITY COLLEGES OFFERING PRE-BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

YEAR	NUMBER	FALL GPA	END OF YEAR GPA
1989-90	2,326	2.59	2.59
1990-91	2,573	2.56	2.57
1991-92	3,153	2.61	2.61
1992-93	3,647	2.61	2.61
1993-94	[illegible],928	2.60	2.59

TRANSFERS' FALL AND END OF YEAR GPA, COMMUNITY COLLEGES NOT OFFERING PRE-BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

YEAR	NUMBER	FALL GPA	END OF YEAR GPA
1989-90	536	2.50	2.58
1990-91	615	2.56	2.59
1991-92	880	2.47	2.51
1992-93	375	2.56	2.67
1993-94	336	2.62	2.64

Source: Transfers' Performance Report, UNC General Administration.

ACADEMIC STANDING OF TRANSFER STUDENTS FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGES, 1993-94

INSTITUTION	NUMBER	PERCENT OF STUDENTS WHOSE STANDING IS:				
		GOOD	PROBATION	SUSPENDED	WITHDREW	GRAD.
<1,000						
Pamlico CC*	1	***	***	***	***	***
Montgomery CC	6	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tri-County CC	17	76.5	0.0	5.9	17.6	0.0
Bladen CC*	35	71.4	2.9	11.4	14.3	0.0
McDowell TCC*	19	57.9	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5
Martin CC	16	75.0	6.3	12.5	6.3	0.0
Brunswick CC*	21	57.1	0.0	28.6	14.3	0.0
Anson CC*	4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Roanoke-Chowan CC*	17	76.5	11.8	0.0	11.8	0.0
1,000-1,999						
Mayland CC*	11	45.5	18.2	27.3	9.1	0.0
James Sprunt CC	30	60.0	0.0	16.7	10.0	13.3
Sampson CC	27	66.7	7.4	14.8	11.1	0.0
Piedmont CC*	12	83.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0
Carteret CC	53	88.7	5.7	1.9	3.8	0.0
Haywood CC*	28	75.0	0.0	7.1	17.9	0.0
Nash CC	47	80.9	8.5	2.1	8.5	0.0
Wilson TCC	11	72.7	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mitchell CC	51	76.5	11.8	2.0	9.8	0.0
Cleveland CC	29	58.6	13.8	17.2	10.3	0.0
Halifax CC	20	85.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Isothermal CC	54	70.4	20.4	3.7	5.6	0.0
Southwestern CC	59	79.7	0.0	10.2	10.2	0.0
Blue Ridge CC	30	70.0	3.3	6.7	20.0	0.0
College of The Albemarle	99	78.8	11.1	1.0	9.1	0.0
Beaufort Co. CC	42	78.6	4.8	14.3	2.4	0.0
Stanly CC	15	60.0	13.3	20.0	6.7	0.0
Richmond CC	38	84.2	5.3	5.3	5.3	0.0
Randolph CC*	31	96.8	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0
Edgecombe CC	15	33.3	13.3	26.7	26.7	0.0
Rockingham CC	68	76.5	4.4	2.9	14.7	1.5
Southeastern CC	81	67.9	8.6	14.8	8.6	0.0
Wilkes CC	97	78.4	14.4	2.1	5.2	0.0
Robeson CC	37	78.4	5.4	2.7	13.5	0.0
Craven CC	103	73.8	6.8	9.7	9.7	0.0
Western Piedmont CC	104	75.0	9.6	6.7	8.7	0.0
2,000-2,999						
Lenoir CC	77	77.9	6.5	10.4	5.2	0.0
Davidson Co. CC	107	76.6	10.3	3.7	9.3	0.0
Caldwell CC & TI	80	82.5	11.3	2.5	3.8	0.0
Surry CC	111	78.4	9.9	1.8	9.0	0.9
Alamance CC*	86	84.9	1.2	1.2	12.8	0.0
Vance-Granville CC	52	78.8	3.8	7.7	9.6	0.0
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	53	62.3	17.0	11.3	9.4	0.0
Wayne CC	81	85.2	3.7	8.6	2.5	0.0
Johnston CC*	43	86.0	0.0	2.3	11.6	0.0
Sandhills CC	147	70.1	8.2	7.5	12.2	2.0
Catawba Valley CC	84	73.8	14.3	4.8	7.1	0.0
3,000-4,999						
Central Carolina CC*	28	64.3	7.1	14.3	10.7	3.6
Cape Fear CC	227	64.8	3.1	24.2	7.9	0.0
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	106	71.7	9.4	4.7	14.2	0.0
Durham TCC	160	91.3	0.6	2.5	3.8	1.9
Pitt CC	117	74.4	9.4	8.5	7.7	0.0
Coastal Carolina CC	134	81.3	2.2	6.7	9.7	0.0
Gaston CC	137	67.9	16.1	7.3	8.8	0.0
Forsyth TCC	153	67.5	9.2	5.2	9.2	0.0
>4,999						
Guilford TCC	211	80.1	6.2	1.9	11.4	0.5
Wake TCC	128	82.8	4.7	7.8	4.7	0.0
Fayetteville TCC	150	84.7	4.0	3.3	8.0	0.0
Central Piedmont CC	464	72.0	12.1	7.3	7.5	1.1
System	3,928	75.7	8.2	7.2	8.4	0.5
System*	336	77.4	3.0	6.8	11.9	0.9

TRANSFERS' FALL AND END OF YEAR GPA, 1993-94

INSTITUTION	NUMBER	FALL GPA	SPR.GPA
<1,000			
Pamlico CC*	1	***	***
Montgomery CC	6	2.28	2.20
Tri-County CC	17	2.97	3.11
Bladen CC*	35	2.57	2.56
McDowell TCC*	19	2.71	2.68
Martin CC	16	2.78	2.85
Brunswick CC*	21	2.50	2.46
Anson CC*	4	3.22	3.28
Roanoke-Chowan CC*	17	2.09	2.00
1,000-1,999			
Mayland CC*	11	1.81	1.70
James Sprunt CC	30	2.71	2.72
Sampson CC	27	2.05	2.22
Piedmont CC*	12	2.65	2.68
Carteret CC	53	2.53	2.66
Haywood CC*	28	2.65	2.84
Nash CC	47	2.55	2.62
Wilson TCC	11	2.40	2.45
Mitchell CC	51	2.67	2.66
Cleveland CC	29	2.39	2.25
Halifax CC	20	2.76	2.71
Isothermal CC	54	2.39	2.42
Southwestern CC	59	2.71	2.86
Blue Ridge CC	30	2.46	2.57
College of The Albemarle	99	3.07	3.07
Beaufort Co. CC	42	2.60	2.57
Stanly CC	15	2.58	2.45
Richmond CC	38	2.40	2.45
Randolph CC*	31	2.75	2.86
Edgecombe CC	15	1.78	1.99
Rockingham CC	68	2.63	2.56
Southeastern CC	81	2.51	2.35
Wilkes CC	97	2.58	2.53
Robeson CC	37	2.07	2.13
Craven CC	103	2.54	2.57
Western Piedmont CC	104	2.45	2.48
2,000-2,999			
Lenoir CC	77	2.50	2.49
Davidson Co. CC	107	2.52	2.60
Caldwell CC & TI	80	2.67	2.69
Surry CC	111	2.74	2.68
Alamance CC*	86	2.82	2.86
Vance-Granville CC	52	2.23	2.41
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	53	2.80	2.45
Wayne CC	81	2.53	2.60
Johnston CC*	43	2.53	2.52
Sandhills CC	147	2.35	2.38
Catawba Valley CC	84	2.77	2.68
3,000-4,999			
Central Carolina CC*	28	2.66	2.52
Cape Fear CC	227	2.30	2.31
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	106	2.76	2.73
Durham TCC	160	2.87	2.88
Pitt CC	117	2.52	2.52
Coastal Carolina CC	134	2.87	2.87
Gaston CC	137	2.49	2.48
Forsyth TCC	153	2.57	2.62
>4,999			
Guilford TCC	211	2.53	2.58
Wake TCC	128	2.62	2.58
Fayetteville TCC	150	2.92	2.88
Central Piedmont CC	464	2.67	2.55
System	3,928	2.60	2.59
System*	336	2.62	2.64

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GPA OF TRANSFERS FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM TO UNC INSTITUTIONS, TRANSFERS FROM FALL 1991 THROUGH FALL 1993

PROGRAMS	QUARTER HOURS COMPLETED AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES							
	18-45		46-89		90+		TOTAL	
	#	GPA	#	GPA	#	GPA	#	GPA
College Transfer	498	2.71	1,067	2.57	710	2.45	2,275	2.57
General Education	135	2.67	221	2.53	108	2.65	464	2.60
Vocational/Technical	201	2.67	305	2.61	335	2.55	841	2.60
TOTAL	834	2.70	1,593	2.57	1,153	2.50	3,580	2.58

Note: Includes only students who transferred within one year of attending community college.

GPA OF TRANSFERS FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGES TO UNC INSTITUTIONS, TRANSFERS FROM FALL 1991 THROUGH FALL 1993

INSTITUTION	FTE	QUARTER HOURS COMPLETED AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES							
		18-45		46-89		90+		TOTAL	
		#	GPA	#	GPA	#	GPA	#	GPA
<1,000									
Pamlico CC	182								
Montgomery CC	662			3	1.93	2	2.34	5	2.12
Tri-County CC	669	8	2.51	18	2.34	5	3.11	31	2.53
Bladen CC	672	10	2.78	27	2.38	16	2.25	53	2.43
McDowell TCC	772	4	2.98	7	2.79	2	3.11	13	2.91
Martin CC	928	2	1.22	1				3	1.22
Brunswick CC	949	5	1.88	4	2.55	6	2.55	15	2.36
Anson CC	951					1		1	
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960	5	2.88	6	2.27	2	1.96	13	2.38
1,000-1,999									
Mayland CC	1,033	3	1.81	8	2.47	5	2.44	16	2.35
James Sprunt CC	1,124	2	3.26	13	2.60	11	2.50	26	2.60
Sampson CC	1,268	2	2.12	11	2.20	18	2.73	31	2.51
Piedmont CC	1,278	3	2.93	4	2.99	1		8	2.95
Carteret CC	1,289	10	2.92	15	2.38	4	3.08	29	2.66
Haywood CC	1,359	4	1.69	2	1.65	4	2.70	10	2.18
Nash CC	1,390	5	3.33	7	2.66	4	2.53	16	2.85
Wilson TCC	1,405	4	2.06	2	1.57			6	1.85
Mitchell CC	1,406	11	2.83	30	2.58	16	2.76	57	2.68
Cleveland CC	1,464	4	2.82	15	2.10	4	1.67	23	2.10
Halifax CC	1,473			7	2.73	5	2.13	12	2.47
Isothermal CC	1,495	15	2.65	36	2.42	20	2.38	71	2.46
Southwestern CC	1,495	12	2.61	20	2.92	11	3.07	43	2.88
Blue Ridge CC	1,500	6	1.41	13	2.78	5	2.51	24	2.54
College of The Albemarle	1,504	12	3.23	31	3.24	14	3.28	57	3.25
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	5	1.92	11	2.89	11	2.30	27	2.45
Stanly CC	1,517	5	3.36	1		3	3.41	9	3.28
Richmond CC	1,522	3	1.67	6	2.14	6	2.64	15	2.30
Randolph CC	1,624	10	2.92	16	2.93	5	2.84	31	2.92
Edgecombe CC	1,647	4	1.69	8	2.07	2	1.70	14	1.90
Rockingham CC	1,670	9	2.40	24	2.60	19	2.09	52	2.38
Southeastern CC	1,717	12	2.06	40	2.50	18	2.29	70	2.38
Wilkes CC	1,740	18	2.79	70	2.63	41	2.65	129	2.66
Robeson CC	1,794	6	2.54	6	2.29	7	2.07	19	2.34
Craven CC	1,980	9	3.22	28	2.75	28	1.89	65	2.45
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	9	2.38	66	2.54	45	2.45	120	2.50
2,000-2,999									
Lenoir CC	2,161	6	2.86	21	2.48	16	2.37	43	2.50
Davidson Co. CC	2,165	18	2.86	40	2.39	38	2.46	96	2.51
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	15	2.74	32	2.94	29	2.70	76	2.81
Surry CC	2,342	29	2.81	85	2.70	72	2.78	186	2.75
Alamance CC	2,522	15	2.82	28	2.93	7	2.78	50	2.87
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	6	2.79	25	2.31	14	1.89	45	2.33
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	4	2.87	5	2.54	4	1.81	13	2.46
Wayne CC	2,680	15	2.75	23	2.58	31	2.43	69	2.55
Johnston CC	2,706	15	2.23	27	2.26	7	2.85	49	2.30
Sandhills CC	2,839	32	2.25	63	2.29	50	2.37	145	2.31
Catawba Valley CC	2,948	14	2.54	24	2.88	23	2.76	61	2.77
3,000-4,999									
Central Carolina CC	3,062	4	2.34	16	2.02	5	2.96	25	2.28
Cape Fear CC	3,080	25	2.47	30	2.23	30	2.35	85	2.35
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	29	3.00	45	2.66	35	2.40	109	2.68
Durham TCC	3,170	38	3.14	30	2.92	34	2.57	102	2.92
Pitt CC	3,260	21	2.53	36	2.32	19	2.70	76	2.48
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	38	3.03	56	2.65	30	2.81	124	2.80
Gaston CC	3,588	40	2.57	65	2.43	40	2.15	145	2.40
Forsyth TCC	4,099	27	2.82	39	2.51	28	2.38	94	2.55
>4,999									
Guilford TCC	5,366	33	2.35	73	2.29	49	2.42	155	2.34
Wake TCC	5,732	24	2.70	22	2.50	24	2.55	70	2.57
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	25	2.67	44	3.08	32	2.85	101	2.92
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	144	2.68	208	2.55	195	2.43	547	2.54
System	129,877	834	2.70	1,593	2.57	1,153	2.50	3,580	2.58

Note: Includes only students who transferred within one year of attending community college

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GPA OF TRANSFERS FROM COLLEGE TRANSFER PROGRAM TO UNC INSTITUTIONS, TRANSFERS FROM FALL 1991 THROUGH FALL 1993

INSTITUTION	PTE	QUARTER HOURS COMPLETED AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES							
		18-45		46-89		90+		TOTAL	
		#	GPA	#	GPA	#	GPA	#	GPA
<1,000									
Pamlico CC	182								
Montgomery CC	662			1				1	
Tri-County CC	669	7	2.50	15	2.67	5	3.11	27	2.69
Bladen CC	672								
McDowell TCC	772								
Martin CC	928	1						1	
Brunswick CC	949								
Anson CC	951								
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960								
1,000-1,999									
Mayland CC	1,033								
James Sprunt CC	1,124	2	3.26	12	2.64	10	2.57	24	2.65
Sampson CC	1,268			1				1	
Piedmont CC	1,278								
Carteret CC	1,289	1		4	3.38			5	3.09
Haywood CC	1,359								
Nash CC	1,390	4	3.13	7	2.66	4	2.53	15	2.75
Wilson TCC	1,405								
Mitchell CC	1,406	11	2.83	27	2.62	14	2.73	52	2.69
Cleveland CC	1,464	4	2.82	13	2.14	3	1.69	20	2.17
Halifax CC	1,473			5	3.09	2	1.08	7	2.46
Isothermal CC	1,495	13	2.60	32	2.44	15	2.46	60	2.48
Southwestern CC	1,495								
Blue Ridge CC	1,500	4	2.09	11	2.68	3	1.88	18	2.47
College of The Albemarle	1,504	11	3.20	19	3.19	7	3.15	37	3.18
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	3	1.44	10	2.88	6	2.49	19	2.53
Stanly CC	1,517								
Richmond CC	1,522	2	1.81	5	2.23	4	2.94	11	2.39
Randolph CC	1,624								
Edgecombe CC	1,647	2	2.07	8	2.07	1		11	2.01
Rockingham CC	1,670	7	2.54	20	2.60	16	2.12	43	2.41
Southeastern CC	1,717	10	2.31	35	2.60	12	2.25	57	2.49
Wilkes CC	1,740	18	2.79	63	2.63	32	2.61	113	2.65
Robeson CC	1,794					1		1	
Craven CC	1,980	9	3.22	25	2.66	25	1.99	59	2.47
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	8	2.54	58	2.50	42	2.43	108	2.47
2,000-2,999									
Lenoir CC	2,161	6	2.86	17	2.38	13	2.37	36	2.47
Davidson Co. CC	2,165	15	2.92	39	2.39	30	2.55	84	2.54
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	14	2.68	32	2.94	25	2.67	71	2.80
Surry CC	2,342	20	2.68	71	2.68	47	2.75	138	2.70
Alamance CC	2,522								
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	4	2.95	23	2.27	12	1.94	39	2.36
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	2	2.74	4	2.81	1		7	2.78
Wayne CC	2,680	12	2.80	22	2.55	28	2.44	62	2.55
Johnston CC	2,706								
Sandhills CC	2,839	27	2.33	56	2.36	37	2.33	120	2.35
Catawba Valley CC	2,948	10	2.70	22	2.87	18	2.67	50	2.77
3,000-4,999									
Central Carolina CC	3,062								
Cape Fear CC	3,080	5	2.62	7	2.05	3	3.00	15	2.40
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	12	2.78	25	2.75	14	2.59	51	2.71
Durham TCC	3,170	27	3.10	22	2.86	25	2.58	74	2.88
Pitt CC	3,260	21	2.53	30	2.29	14	2.50	65	2.41
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	37	3.02	55	2.63	28	2.78	120	2.78
Gaston CC	3,588	33	2.64	57	2.48	29	2.11	119	2.45
Forsyth TCC	4,099	8	3.08	17	2.36	15	2.19	40	2.44
>4,999									
Guilford TCC	5,366	11	2.03	26	2.35	25	2.27	62	2.25
Wake TCC	5,732	9	2.97	7	2.63	7	2.51	23	2.71
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	8	2.19	3	3.25	3	2.04	14	2.40
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	100	2.69	161	2.53	134	2.44	395	2.54
System	129,877	498	2.71	1,067	2.57	710	2.45	2,275	2.57

Note: Includes only students who transferred within one year of attending community college

GPA OF TRANSFERS FROM GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM TO UNC INSTITUTIONS, TRANSFERS FROM FALL 1991 THROUGH FALL 1993

INSTITUTION	FTE	QUARTER HOURS COMPLETED AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES							
		18-45		46-89		90+		TOTAL	
		#	GPA	#	GPA	#	GPA	#	GPA
<1,000									
Pamlico CC	182								
Montgomery CC	662			1				1	
Tri-County CC	669								
Bladen CC	672	9	2.73	25	2.44	14	2.30	48	2.47
McDowell TCC	772	4	2.98	7	2.79			11	2.88
Martin CC	928								
Brunswick CC	949	5	1.88	4	2.55	6	2.55	15	2.36
Anson CC	951					1		1	
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960	1		3	2.32			4	2.34
1,000-1,999									
Mayland CC	1,033	1		7	2.44	4	2.36	12	2.40
James Sprunt CC	1,124			1		1		2	2.11
Sampson CC	1,268	2	2.12	8	2.14	15	2.56	25	2.39
Piedmont CC	1,278	2	2.93	2	3.70			4	3.19
Carteret CC	1,289	8	2.99	9	2.12	1		18	2.63
Haywood CC	1,359	2	2.06			1		3	2.46
Nash CC	1,390								
Wilson TCC	1,405	3	2.06					3	2.06
Mitchell CC	1,406								
Cleveland CC	1,464								
Halifax CC	1,473								
Isothermal CC	1,495								
Southwestern CC	1,495	4	2.72	11	2.98	5	2.23	20	2.75
Blue Ridge CC	1,500								
College of The Albemarle	1,504			4	3.59	3	3.69	7	3.65
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515								
Stanly CC	1,517	1						1	
Richmond CC	1,522								
Randolph CC	1,624	9	2.93	16	2.93	4	2.77	29	2.92
Edgecombe CC	1,647								
Rockingham CC	1,670					1		1	
Southeastern CC	1,717								
Wilkes CC	1,740								
Robeson CC	1,794	1		1				2	2.17
Craven CC	1,980								
Western Piedmont CC	1,982			1				1	
2,000-2,999									
Lenoir CC	2,161								
Davidson Co. CC	2,165								
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314								
Surry CC	2,342								
Alamance CC	2,522	10	2.73	11	3.02	3	3.09	24	2.90
Vance-Granville CC	2,540								
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633								
Wayne CC	2,680								
Johnston CC	2,706	15	2.23	26	2.18	1		42	2.24
Sandhills CC	2,839	1		2	2.15	1		4	1.82
Catawba Valley CC	2,948								
3,000-4,999									
Central Carolina CC	3,062	3	2.56	12	1.86	4	3.04	19	2.28
Cape Fear CC	3,080	17	2.58	23	2.30	8	2.22	48	2.40
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161								
Durham TCC	3,170	1						1	
Pitt CC	3,260								
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346								
Gaston CC	3,588								
Forsyth TCC	4,099								
>4,999									
Guilford TCC	5,366	15	2.56	22	2.29	7	2.51	44	2.42
Wake TCC	5,732	2	3.60					2	3.60
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	7	2.75	11	2.67	8	3.05	26	2.79
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	12	2.78	14	2.57	20	2.63	46	2.65
System	129,877	135	2.67	221	2.53	108	2.65	464	2.60

Note: Includes only students who transferred within one year of attending community college

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GPA OF TRANSFERS FROM VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL PROGRAM TO UNC INSTITUTIONS, TRANSFERS FROM FALL 1991 THROUGH FALL 1993

INSTITUTION	FTE	QUARTER HOURS COMPLETED AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES							
		18-45		46-89		90+		TOTAL	
		#	GPA	#	GPA	#	GPA	#	GPA
<1,000									
Pamlico CC	182								
Montgomery CC	662			1		2	2.34	3	2.29
Tri-County CC	669	1		3	1.29			4	1.69
Bladen CC	672	1		2	1.35	2	1.81	5	1.86
McDowell TCC	772					2	3.11	2	3.11
Martin CC	928	1		1				2	
Brunswick CC	949								
Anson CC	951								
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960	4	2.99	3	2.22	2	1.96	9	2.41
1,000-1,999									
Mayland CC	1,033	2	1.79	1		1		4	2.22
James Sprunt CC	1,124								
Sampson CC	1,268			2	3.66	3	3.51	5	3.55
Piedmont CC	1,278	1		2	1.00	1		4	2.15
Carteret CC	1,289	1		2	0.94	3	2.69	6	2.25
Haywood CC	1,359	2	1.43	2	1.65	3	2.67	7	2.10
Nash CC	1,390	1						1	
Wilson TCC	1,405	1		2	1.57			3	1.57
Mitchell CC	1,406			3	2.15	2	2.95	5	2.58
Cleveland CC	1,464			2	1.75	1		3	1.69
Halifax CC	1,473			2	1.92	3	2.87	5	2.48
Isothermal CC	1,495	2	3.06	4	2.21	5	2.15	11	2.30
Southwestern CC	1,495	8	2.49	9	2.80	6	3.72	23	3.04
Blue Ridge CC	1,500	2	0.81	2	3.11	2	3.05	6	2.66
College of The Albemarle	1,504	1		8	3.27	4	3.13	13	3.24
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	2	2.56	1		5	2.14	8	2.27
Stanly CC	1,517	4	3.02	1		3	3.14	8	3.03
Richmond CC	1,522	1		1		2	2.40	4	2.17
Randolph CC	1,624	1				1		2	2.96
Edgecombe CC	1,647	2	1.03			1		3	1.31
Rockingham CC	1,670	2	1.83	4	2.73	2	0.00	8	1.87
Southeastern CC	1,717	2	0.70	5	1.69	6	2.35	13	1.88
Wilkes CC	1,740			7	2.62	9	2.84	16	2.72
Robeson CC	1,794	5	2.56	5	2.44	6	2.20	16	2.42
Craven CC	1,980			3	3.68	3	0.83	6	2.32
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	1		7	2.93	3	2.88	11	2.80
2,000-2,999									
Lenoir CC	2,161			4	2.77	3	2.38	7	2.66
Davidson Co. CC	2,165	3	2.48	1		8	2.09	12	2.22
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	1				4	2.83	5	2.92
Surry CC	2,342	9	3.03	14	2.83	25	2.86	48	2.89
Alamance CC	2,522	5	3.04	17	2.86	4	2.34	26	2.83
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	2	1.49	2	3.12	2	1.37	6	1.93
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	2	3.25	1		3	1.81	6	2.03
Wayne CC	2,680	3	2.51	1		3	2.41	7	2.56
Johnston CC	2,706			1		6	2.49	7	2.93
Sandhills CC	2,839	4	2.18	5	1.72	12	2.48	21	2.19
Catawba Valley CC	2,948	4	2.16	2	3.10	5	3.28	11	2.78
3,000-4,999									
Central Carolina CC	3,062	1		4	2.46	1		6	2.28
Cape Fear CC	3,080	3	1.61			19	2.31	22	2.21
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	17	3.23	20	2.49	21	2.21	58	2.64
Durham TCC	3,170	10	3.23	8	3.07	9	2.55	27	3.01
Pitt CC	3,260			6	2.61	5	3.27	11	2.99
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	1		1		2	3.10	4	3.26
Gaston CC	3,588	7	2.16	8	2.01	11	2.25	26	2.16
Forsyth TCC	4,099	19	2.66	22	2.67	13	2.63	54	2.66
>4,999									
Guilford TCC	5,366	7	2.86	25	2.20	17	2.56	49	2.41
Wake TCC	5,732	13	2.28	15	2.44	17	2.56	45	2.45
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	10	3.17	30	3.20	21	2.90	61	3.10
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	32	2.64	33	2.67	41	2.25	106	2.50
System	129,877	201	2.67	305	2.61	335	2.55	841	2.60

Note: Includes only students who transferred within one year of attending community college

Recommendation

Data on the performance of community college transfers to non-UNC institutions should be investigated. The UNC-General Administration and North Carolina Community College System should continue to examine transfer issues and student success. A common definition of what constitutes a transfer student should be developed.

Background

There are 27 technical/vocational curriculums which prepare students for licensing and/or certification exams. A licensure requirement for an occupation is one that is required by state statute for an individual to work in that occupation. Certification is generally voluntary but may be required by employers or an outside accrediting agency.

Not all licensing boards have cooperated with the Community College System Office by providing data on student success. This year, data from 13 of the licensing and certification boards were obtained. Data were not available from two licensing boards that had provided data in past years. The NC Department of Human Resources, which is responsible for the Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) licenses, did not supply data on the EMT license exams. The American Occupational Therapy Certification Board Inc. has contacted the Community College System Office with their concern about the amount of staff time they must commit to provide the System Office with college data. We will continue to work with them to overcome this obstacle.

The data that were obtained are for first time test takers who took the exam between July 1, 1993 and June 30, 1994. The one exception to this is the insurance exam results which were for January 1, 1994-December 31, 1994. In past CSF reports the exam results for cosmetology students reflected students taking the test more than once. In 1992-93 the NC State Board of Cosmetology developed a student database which allows them to report first time test takers and their success rate more accurately.

Passing rates indicate how successful the program has been. However, passing rates can be affected by the native ability of the students or their preparation prior to entering the curriculum. In addition, many students take coursework to learn a skill and do not necessarily intend to become licensed. Since these students do not take the licensure test, the success of programs in their preparation cannot be determined using passing rates on exams. Finally, without established baselines on examination passing rates, it is difficult to make judgments as to what constitutes a "good" or "bad" passing rate.

Implications

In the case of nursing, graduates of associate degree and baccalaureate degree programs take the same examination to become licensed as a registered nurse, and community college associate degree graduates have consistently had higher passing rates than baccalaureate nursing program graduates. Nursing scores have been maintained even though the numbers enrolled and completing have expanded over the years.

Data on the passing rates for 22 other exams were obtained. The data for several of these exams, however, were available for the first time this year. No trend data on passing rates for community college students on these exams are available. In addition, comparative data on passing rates for students who were not enrolled in community colleges or students in training programs in other states were not available. This limits our ability to evaluate how well our students are doing.

Seven of the licensure/certification exams had a passing rate of less than 70 percent. At this point it is not known why the rates were as low as they were nor how these rates compare with the passing rates of other schools. It is also not known as to what percent of those who fail the exam the first time, retake the exam and are successful. In the cases of real estate and insurance, it should be pointed out that students do not have to complete the program to be eligible for the licensure exam. It is likely that a large number of students taking the exam, especially those taking the exam for the first time (which are reported here), have only completed the minimum required courses for the exam, not the entire program. It should also be noted that 4 of the 7 exams with a passing rate of less than 70 percent had 26 or fewer test takers. In these situations, a relatively few students who fail the exam the first time will result in a low passing rate for the system.

Data

PERCENTAGE OF NCCCS GRADUATES PASSING THE NATIONAL COUNCIL LICENSURE EXAM FOR NURSES (RN)

YEAR	# OF CC GRAD. TAKING EXAM	CC GRADUATES AS % OF TOTAL TAKING EXAM	% OF GRAD. PASSING EXAMS	% NON-CC TAKERS PASSING EXAM	
				HOSPITAL DIPLOMA	UNIVERSITY
1990	1,303	73	94	94	92
1991	1,332	73	94	94	91
1992	1,511	71	94	93	93
1993	1,474	65	96	97	95
1994	1,963	56	95	97	90

Source: ***NC Board of Nursing.***

PERCENTAGE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS PASSING LICENSING AND CERTIFICATION EXAMINATIONS

FIELD	NUMBER OF STUDENTS TAKING EXAM	% PASSING EXAM
Aviation Maintenance		
General	59	100
Airframe 1	49	96
Power Plant	55	100
Basic Law Enforcement Trng.	1,779	98
Cosmetology	790	96
Dental Assisting	115	82
Dental Hygiene	106	93
Insurance		
Life and Health	341	73
Health	1	100
Property and Liability	346	69
Medicaid/Medicare Supp.	14	21
Medical Records	35	80
Medical Sonography		
Physics	17	100
Abdomen	16	69
OB-GYN	17	53
Echo	2	100
Nursing		
RN	1,963	95
PN	1,011	97
Opticianry	26	35
Physical Therapist Assistant	80	90
Real Estate		
Broker	257	67
Sales	1,495	68
Veterinary Medicine Tech.	45	98

Source:* *Planning and Research, NC Community College System Office.

Recommendation

These data are especially valuable. They have a direct and unambiguous relationship to the quality of the program and should be carefully monitored over time.

The remaining licensing boards must begin to supply the data on community college graduates. Difficulties identifying these graduates can and should be overcome. Comparative data on passing rates for each licensure exam should be identified and collected.

PASSING RATES ON LICENSING AND CERTIFICATION EXAMINATIONS, 1993-94
—NURSING—

INSTITUTION	FTE	PRACTICAL NURSING		REGISTERED NURSING	
		# TESTED	% PASS	# TESTED	% PASS
<1,000					
Pamlico CC	182				
Montgomery CC	662	23	96		
Tri-County CC	669	13	100	11	91
Bladen CC	672				
McDowell TCC	772				
Martin CC	928				
Brunswick CC	949	24	83		
Anson CC	951				
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960	24	100	21	100
1,000-1,999					
Mayland CC	1,033	25	100		
James Sprunt CC	1,124	19	95	43	84
Sampson CC	1,268	18	100	46	74
Piedmont CC	1,278			32	88
Carteret CC	1,289	14	100		
Haywood CC	1,359	13	100		
Nash CC	1,390				
Wilson TCC	1,405				
Mitchell CC	1,406			42	88
Cleveland CC	1,464	13	100		
Halifax CC	1,473				
Isothermal CC	1,495	20	90		
Southwestern CC	1,495	15	93		
Blue Ridge CC	1,500			23	91
College of The Albemarle	1,504	15	93	43	98
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	18	100	29	100
Stanly CC	1,517	2	100	31	100
Richmond CC	1,522	22	96	15	100
Randolph CC	1,624			47	91
Edgecombe CC	1,647				
Rockingham CC	1,670	17	82	52	94
Southeastern CC	1,717	14	100	50	94
Wilkes CC	1,740			36	100
Robeson CC	1,794	27	100	36	93
Craven CC	1,980	16	100	69	90
Western Piedmont CC	1,982			52	94
2,000-2,999					
Lenoir CC	2,161	11	100	34	91
Davidson Co. CC	2,165			86	94
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	32	100	14	100
Surry CC	2,342	26	100	61	97
Alamance CC	2,522	23	100	41	95
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	3	100	45	98
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	33	100	52	94
Wayne CC	2,680			47	98
Johnston CC	2,706	43	100	48	100
Sandhills CC	2,839	29	90	64	98
Catawba Valley CC	2,948			37	100
3,000-4,999					
Central Carolina CC	3,062	30	97	25	96
Cape Fear CC	3,080	12	100	35	97
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	45	98	58	98
Durham TCC	3,170	27	89	56	95
Pitt CC	3,260	49	100	71	92
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	12	100	28	100
Gaston CC	3,588	19	89	48	100
Forsyth TCC	4,099	65	98	60	87
>4,999					
Guilford TCC	5,366	58	98	45	100
Wake TCC	5,732			72	100
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	16	88	69	100
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	12	92	66	92
NEWH Consortium		114	94	123	92
System	129,877	897	97	1,840	95

PASSING RATES ON LICENSING AND CERTIFICATION EXAMINATIONS, 1993-94
—BASIC LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING—

INSTITUTION	FTE	BLET	
		# TESTED	% PASS
<1,000			
Pamlico CC	182		
Montgomery CC	662	34	85
Tri-County CC	669		
Bladen CC	672	8	100
McDowell TCC	772	11	100
Martin CC	928		
Brunswick CC	949	24	100
Anson CC	951		
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960		
1,000-1,999			
Mayland CC	1,033	33	100
James Sprunt CC	1,124	16	100
Sampson CC	1,268	19	100
Piedmont CC	1,278		
Carteret CC	1,289	43	100
Haywood CC	1,359		
Nash CC	1,390		
Wilson TCC	1,405	41	100
Mitchell CC	1,406	39	97
Cleveland CC	1,464	29	100
Halifax CC	1,473	32	100
Isothermal CC	1,495	32	100
Southwestern CC	1,495	49	98
Blue Ridge CC	1,500		
College of The Albemarl	1,504	25	100
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	38	87
Stanly CC	1,517	40	95
Richmond CC	1,522		
Randolph CC	1,624	40	100
Edgecombe CC	1,647		
Rockingham CC	1,670		
Southeastern CC	1,717	22	91
Wilkes CC	1,740	21	100
Robeson CC	1,794	63	100
Craven CC	1,980	30	100
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	43	100
2,000-2,999			
Lenoir CC	2,161		
Davidson Co. CC	2,165	74	100
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314		
Surry CC	2,342	18	89
Alamance CC	2,522	14	100
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	55	96
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	65	100
Wayne CC	2,680	31	100
Johnston CC	2,706	51	98
Sandhills CC	2,839		
Catawba Valley CC	2,948	43	98
3,000-4,999			
Central Carolina CC	3,062	50	98
Cape Fear CC	3,080	81	99
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	87	99
Durham TCC	3,170	31	100
Pitt CC	3,260	53	96
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	56	100
Gaston CC	3,588	80	99
Forsyth TCC	4,099	27	96
>4,999			
Guilford TCC	5,366	78	96
Wake TCC	5,732	55	98
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	98	100
Central Piedmont CC	9,973		
System	129,877	1,779	98

PASSING RATES ON LICENSING AND CERTIFICATION EXAMINATIONS, 1993-94
—REAL ESTATE—

INSTITUTION	FTE	SALES		BROKER	
		# TESTED	% PASS	# TESTED	% PASS
<1,000					
Pamlico CC	182				
Montgomery CC	662				
Tri-County CC	669	30	73	3	67
Bladen CC	672	2	50		
McDowell TCC	772	3	100		
Martin CC	928	5	20		
Brunswick CC	949	34	41	14	79
Anson CC	951	23	83		
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960	12	33		
1,000-1,999					
Mayland CC	1,033	20	70		
James Sprunt CC	1,124	5	80		
Sampson CC	1,268	1	100		
Piedmont CC	1,278	5	60		
Carteret CC	1,289	13	62		
Haywood CC	1,359	3	67		
Nash CC	1,390	28	61		
Wilson TCC	1,405	19	47		
Mitchell CC	1,406	20	70	5	60
Cleveland CC	1,464	12	33		
Halifax CC	1,473	13	92	3	67
Isothermal CC	1,495	28	43	13	62
Southwestern CC	1,495	30	87		
Blue Ridge CC	1,500	18	83		
College of The Albemarle	1,504	75	73	2	50
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	12	75		
Stanly CC	1,517	7	14		
Richmond CC	1,522	7	86		
Randolph CC	1,624	10	40	3	33
Edgecombe CC	1,647	8	38		
Rockingham CC	1,670	3	100		
Southeastern CC	1,717	4	50		
Wilkes CC	1,740	21	57		
Robeson CC	1,794	3	67	1	100
Craven CC	1,980	7	43	2	100
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	7	57	1	100
2,000-2,999					
Lenoir CC	2,161	8	50		
Davidson Co. CC	2,165	15	47	3	67
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	6	67	1	0
Surry CC	2,342	13	69	3	100
Alamance CC	2,522	48	75	19	63
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	31	58		
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	21	86	3	67
Wayne CC	2,680	6	83		
Johnston CC	2,706	35	89		
Sandhills CC	2,839	26	88	9	78
Catawba Valley CC	2,948	43	63	2	50
3,000-4,999					
Central Carolina CC	3,062	40	60	13	69
Cape Fear CC	3,080	42	76	12	75
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	9	89	6	67
Durham TCC	3,170	83	60	22	68
Pitt CC	3,260	39	67	13	54
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	27	78	6	100
Gaston CC	3,588	25	60	10	60
Forsyth TCC	4,099	83	60	3	33
>4,999					
Guilford TCC	5,366	97	69	26	69
Wake TCC	5,732	95	75	20	65
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	54	57	20	50
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	161	81	19	84
System	129,877	1,495	68	257	67

PASSING RATES ON LICENSING AND CERTIFICATION EXAMINATIONS, 1993-94
—INSURANCE—

INSTITUTION	FTE	LIFE & HEALTH		HEALTH		PROPERTY & LIABILITY		MEDICARE SUPP/LTC	
		#TEST	%PASS	#TEST	%PASS	#TEST	%PASS	#TEST	%PASS
<1,000									
Pamlico CC	182								
Montgomery CC	662								
Tri-County CC	669					1	100		
Bladen CC	672								
McDowell TCC	772								
Martin CC	928	4	50						
Brunswick CC	949								
Anson CC	951								
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960								
1,000-1,999									
Mayland CC	1,033								
James Sprunt CC	1,124								
Sampson CC	1,268								
Piedmont CC	1,278								
Carteret CC	1,289	9	67			12	67		
Haywood CC	1,359								
Nash CC	1,390	38	66			29	72		
Wilson TCC	1,405								
Mitchell CC	1,406	1	100						
Cleveland CC	1,464								
Halifax CC	1,473	2	50			3	67		
Isothermal CC	1,495	5	80						
Southwestern CC	1,495								
Blue Ridge CC	1,500								
College of The Albemarle	1,504	12	75			5	20	1	0
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515								
Stanly CC	1,517								
Richmond CC	1,522								
Randolph CC	1,624	6	83			2	0	1	100
Edgecombe CC	1,647					1	100		
Rockingham CC	1,670					9	67		
Southeastern CC	1,717	1	0			2	50		
Wilkes CC	1,740	8	63			9	100		
Robeson CC	1,794	1	100			8	63		
Craven CC	1,980	8	38						
Western Piedmont CC	1,982					4	75		
2,000-2,999									
Lenoir CC	2,161	29	76			30	63	2	0
Davidson Co. CC	2,165	5	80			13	69		
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	8	88			17	59		
Surry CC	2,342					8	50		
Alamance CC	2,522	7	71			17	82		
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	3	100						
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	16	75			5	80		
Wayne CC	2,680	8	63			10	70	5	20
Johnston CC	2,706	5	100			3	100		
Sandhills CC	2,839	1	100			1	0		
Catawba Valley CC	2,948	12	58			8	50		
3,000-4,999									
Central Carolina CC	3,062					1	100		
Cape Fear CC	3,080								
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	19	68			11	64	4	25
Durham TCC	3,170	3	67			7	57		
Pitt CC	3,260								
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	12	58			21	62	1	0
Gaston CC	3,588								
Forsyth TCC	4,099	12	92			9	67		
>4,999									
Guilford TCC	5,366					1	0		
Wake TCC	5,732	3	67			12	58		
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	28	82			37	68		
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	75	76	1	100	50	86		
System	129,877	341	73	1	100	346	69	14	21

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PASSING RATES ON LICENSING AND CERTIFICATION EXAMINATIONS, 1993-94
COSMETOLOGY—OPTICIANRY—MEDICAL RECORDS—VETERINARY MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY

Institution	FTE	Cosmetology		Opticianry		Med. Records		Vet.Med.Tech.	
		#Test	%Pass	#Test	%Pass	#Test	%Pass	#Test	%PASS
<1,000									
Pamlico CC	182								
Montgomery CC	662								
Tri-County CC	669	20	100						
Bladen CC	672	3	100						
McDowell TCC	772	21	90						
Martin CC	928	14	100						
Brunswick CC	949	93	92						
Anson CC	951	18	94						
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960	10	90						
1,000-1,999									
Mayland CC	1,033	18	94						
James Sprunt CC	1,124	16	100						
Sampson CC	1,268	13	100						
Piedmont CC	1,278	11	100						
Carteret CC	1,289	19	89						
Haywood CC	1,359	25	92						
Nash CC	1,390	15	100						
Wilson TCC	1,405								
Mitchell CC	1,406								
Cleveland CC	1,464								
Halifax CC	1,473								
Isothermal CC	1,495	17	100						
Southwestern CC	1,495	17	100						
Blue Ridge CC	1,500	10	100						
College of The Albemarle	1,504	10	100						
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	9	100						
Stanly CC	1,517	27	100						
Richmond CC	1,522								
Randolph CC	1,624								
Edgecombe CC	1,647	24	100						
Rockingham CC	1,670	14	100						
Southeastern CC	1,717	11	100						
Wilkes CC	1,740								
Robeson CC	1,794	25	100						
Craven CC	1,980	64	97						
Western Piedmont CC	1,982								
2,000-2,999									
Lenoir CC	2,161	25	88						
Davidson Co. CC	2,165					10	80		
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	23	96						
Surry CC	2,342								
Alamance CC	2,522	11	100						
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	47	87						
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633								
Wayne CC	2,680	40	78						
Johnston CC	2,706	23	100						
Sandhills CC	2,839	24	92						
Catawba Valley CC	2,948								
3,000-4,999									
Central Carolina CC	3,062	17	94					45	98
Cape Fear CC	3,080								
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161								
Durham TCC	3,170			26	35				
Pitt CC	3,260					5	100		
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346								
Gaston CC	3,588								
Forsyth TCC	4,099								
>4,999									
Guilford TCC	5,366	24	100						
Wake TCC	5,732								
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	32	88						
Central Piedmont CC	9,973					20	75		
System	129,877	790	96	26	35	35	80	45	98

PASSING RATES ON LICENSING AND CERTIFICATION EXAMINATIONS, 1993-94
DENTAL ASSISTING—DENTAL HYGIENE—PHYSICAL THERAPY ASSISTANT

INSTITUTION	FTE	DENTAL ASSISTING		DENTAL HYGENE		PHYSICAL THERAPY	
		# TESTED	% PASS	# TESTED	% PASS	# TESTED	% PASS
<1,000							
Pamlico CC	182						
Montgomery CC	662						
Tri-County CC	669						
Bladen CC	672						
McDowell TCC	772						
Martin CC	928					17	88
Brunswick CC	949						
Anson CC	951						
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960						
1,000-1,999							
Mayland CC	1,033						
James Sprunt CC	1,124						
Sampson CC	1,268						
Piedmont CC	1,278						
Carteret CC	1,289						
Haywood CC	1,359						
Nash CC	1,390					14	100
Wilson TCC	1,405						
Mitchell CC	1,406						
Cleveland CC	1,464						
Halifax CC	1,473						
Isothermal CC	1,495						
Southwestern CC	1,495					10	90
Blue Ridge CC	1,500						
College of The Albemarle	1,504						
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515						
Stanly CC	1,517					11	91
Richmond CC	1,522						
Randolph CC	1,624						
Edgecombe CC	1,647						
Rockingham CC	1,670						
Southeastern CC	1,717						
Wilkes CC	1,740	9	89				
Robeson CC	1,794						
Craven CC	1,980						
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	11	73				
2,000-2,999							
Lenoir CC	2,161						
Davidson Co. CC	2,165						
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314					15	73
Surry CC	2,342						
Alamance CC	2,522	19	63				
Vance-Granville CC	2,540						
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	13	77				
Wayne CC	2,680	17	94	18	83		
Johnston CC	2,706						
Sandhills CC	2,839						
Catawba Valley CC	2,948						
3,000-4,999							
Central Carolina CC	3,062						
Cape Fear CC	3,080						
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	10	80	13	100		
Durham TCC	3,170						
Pitt CC	3,260						
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	19	95	17	88		
Gaston CC	3,588						
Forsyth TCC	4,099						
>4,999							
Guilford TCC	5,366	9	66	25	100		
Wake TCC	5,732	7	100				
Fayetteville TCC	8,254			12	92	13	100
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	1	100	21	95		
System	129,877	115	82	106	93	80	90

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PASSING RATES ON LICENSING AND CERTIFICATION EXAMINATIONS, 1993-94
—MEDICAL SONOGRAPHY—

INSTITUTION	FTE	PHYSICS		ABDOMEN		OB-GYN		ECHO	
		#TEST	%PASS	#TEST	%PASS	#TEST	%PASS	#TEST	%PASS
<1,000									
Pamlico CC	182								
Montgomery CC	662								
Tri-County CC	669								
Bladen CC	672								
McDowell TCC	772								
Martin CC	928								
Brunswick CC	949								
Anson CC	951								
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960								
1,000-1,999									
Mayland CC	1,033								
James Sprunt CC	1,124								
Sampson CC	1,268								
Piedmont CC	1,278								
Carteret CC	1,289								
Haywood CC	1,359								
Nash CC	1,390								
Wilson TCC	1,405								
Mitchell CC	1,406								
Cleveland CC	1,464								
Halifax CC	1,473								
Isothermal CC	1,495								
Southwestern CC	1,495								
Blue Ridge CC	1,500								
College of The Albemarle	1,504								
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515								
Stanly CC	1,517								
Richmond CC	1,522								
Randolph CC	1,624								
Edgecombe CC	1,64[illegible]								
Rockingham CC	1,670								
Southeastern CC	1,717								
Wilkes CC	1,740								
Robeson CC	1,794								
Craven CC	1,980								
Western Piedmont CC	1,982								
2,000-2,999									
Lenoir CC	2,161								
Davidson Co. CC	2,165								
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	11	100	5	80	10	70	1	100
Surry CC	2,342								
Alamance CC	2,522								
Vance-Granville CC	2,540								
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633								
Wayne CC	2,680								
Johnston CC	2,706								
Sandhills CC	2,839								
Catawba Valley CC	2,948								
3,000-4,999									
Central Carolina CC	3,062								
Cape Fear CC	3,080								
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161								
Durham TCC	3,170								
Pitt CC	3,260	1	100	6	33	7	29	1	100
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346								
Gaston CC	3,588								
Forsyth TCC	4,099	5	100	5	100				
>4,999									
Guilford TCC	5,366								
Wake TCC	5,732								
Fayetteville TCC	8,254								
Central Piedmont CC	9,973								
System	129,877	17	100	16	69	17	53	2	100

PASSING RATES ON LICENSING AND CERTIFICATION EXAMINATIONS, 1993-94
—AVIATION—

INSTITUTION	FTE	GENERAL		AIRFRAME		POWER PLANT	
		# TESTED	% PASS	# TESTED	% PASS	# TESTED	% PASS
<1,000							
Pamlico CC	182						
Montgomery CC	662						
Tri-County CC	669						
Bladen CC	672						
McDowell TCC	772						
Martin CC	928						
Brunswick CC	949						
Anson CC	951						
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960						
1,000-1,999							
Mayland CC	1,033						
James Sprunt CC	1,124						
Sampson CC	1,268						
Piedmont CC	1,278						
Carteret CC	1,289						
Haywood CC	1,359						
Nash CC	1,390						
Wilson TCC	1,405						
Mitchell CC	1,406						
Cleveland CC	1,464						
Halifax CC	1,473						
Isothermal CC	1,495						
Southwestern CC	1,495						
Blue Ridge CC	1,500						
College of The Albemarle	1,504						
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515						
Stanly CC	1,517						
Richmond CC	1,522						
Randolph CC	1,624						
Edgecombe CC	1,647						
Rockingham CC	1,670						
Southeastern CC	1,717						
Wilkes CC	1,740						
Robeson CC	1,794						
Craven CC	1,980						
Western Piedmont CC	1,982						
2,000-2,999							
Lenoir CC	2,161						
Davidson Co. CC	2,165						
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314						
Surry CC	2,342						
Alamance CC	2,522						
Vance-Granville CC	2,540						
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633						
Wayne CC	2,680	17	100	12	100	15	100
Johnston CC	2,706						
Sandhills CC	2,839						
Catawba Valley CC	2,948						
3,000-4,999							
Central Carolina CC	3,062						
Cape Fear CC	3,080						
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161						
Durham TCC	3,170						
Pitt CC	3,260						
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346						
Gaston CC	3,588						
Forsyth TCC	4,099						
>4,999							
Guilford TCC	5,366	42	100	37	95	40	100
Wake TCC	5,732						
Fayetteville TCC	8,254						
Central Piedmont CC	9,973						
System	129,877	59	100	49	96	55	100

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROFESSIONAL BOARD CONTACTS FOR CSF MEASURE I.E. LICENSURE PASSING RATES

EXAM	AGENCY	CONTACT
Basic Law Enforcement	NC Dept. of Justice 919/733-2530	Wayne Coats
Cosmetology	NC State Board of Cosmetology 919/850-2793	Epsie Dobbin
Dental Assisting	Dental Assisting National Board Inc. 312/642-3368	Fred Davis
Dental Hygiene	NC State Board of Dental Examiners 919/781-4901	Lisa Mayberry
Emergency Medical Technician	NC Dept. of Human Resources 919/733-2285	Hadley Whittemore
Insurance	NC Dept. of Insurance 919/733-7487	Louis Johnson
Medical Records	American Health Information Management Association 312/787-2672	Judith Merritt
Nursing	NC Board of Nursing 919/782-3211	Rose Woodlief
Opticianry	NC State Board of Opticians 919/733-9321	Willard Barnes
Physical Therapy	NC Board of Physical Therapy 919/490-6393	Constance Peake
Real Estate	NC Real Estate Commission 919/733-9580	Melton Black
Veterinary	NC Veterinary Medical Board 919/733-7689	Barbara Perryman

Background

Students attend community colleges for a wide variety of reasons. Unlike traditional university students, a large number of students enrolled in community colleges are not pursuing a degree. Some students are pursuing basic literacy skills, others are in search of job preparation skills or job retraining, still others are preparing for transfer to a four-year institution. These students attend community colleges in order to obtain specific skills or knowledge that will enable them to attain their goal, which may be employment, transferring to a four-year institution, or simply self-improvement.

Depending on the reason for attending, students may enroll in a community college for just one quarter or they may be in the pursuit of a certificate, diploma, or degree. Further, many students who enroll in community colleges do so on a part-time basis. These students, due to employment constraints or family responsibilities, simply cannot attend college on a full-time basis or even necessarily attend each quarter. As a result, calculation of program completion rates and the assessment of the appropriateness of a program completion rate is difficult.

The calculation of an accurate program completion rate must account for student intention. That is to say, since many students enroll in a community college without the intention of completing a program, any calculation of a program completion rate must eliminate these students. To be accurate, a program completion rate must be based solely on those students who enroll in a community college with the intent of earning a certificate, diploma, or degree.

Presently it is not possible to compute an accurate completion rate. Steps have been undertaken that will allow for the future calculation of program completion rates. Beginning in 1991-92, student intent was added to the Curriculum Student Progress Information System. Information is now being gathered at all colleges on students' intentions for enrolling. Among the reasons for enrolling that students can select is the intent of obtaining a certificate, degree, or diploma. With this information, a program completion rate based on student intent can be calculated in the future. In addition, implementation of the federal Right to Know legislation has mandated tracking cohorts for 150 percent of the time needed to complete a program. These data will be available in the future.

Recommendation

The State Board of Community Colleges has adopted an Annual Program Audit for all colleges to use in reviewing all programs and services annually. In addition, the State Board has adopted performance standards for certain key measures in the Annual Program Audit. Among the measures for which standards have been adopted is student goal accomplishment, which includes completion rates, as well as other goal attainment by students. This measure will more accurately reflect the success of students in programs in community colleges than will looking just at graduation rates. Therefore, it is recommended that this measure be modified in the future to examine both graduation rates and student goal accomplishment.

In addition, efforts should be made to identify the core courses in a program that enable a student to leave the program, without completing, but possessing marketable skills. With this information, a modified program completion rate could be developed that would reflect students gaining marketable skills.

Background

Students who enroll in community colleges are often unprepared for college level coursework. Unlike the traditional university, community colleges maintain an "open door" philosophy and, as a result, serve non-traditional students and students who have not been properly prepared for post-secondary education. For many of these students, the colleges must first equip them with the basic skills and knowledge necessary to pursue college level courses.

Colleges have developed remedial courses for students who have deficiencies in core course areas. The purpose of the remedial courses is to prepare students with the skills and knowledge necessary for success in their college studies. Once students have successfully completed the remedial courses, they can then move into the regular college program.

The passing rates for remedial courses is one measure of student success. This measure provides an indication of the success of colleges in alleviating student deficiencies and preparing students for college level work. In other words, it is a measure of the success of the colleges in providing students with the basic skills necessary for post-secondary education.

It is currently not possible to identify passing rates for remedial courses. A computer program has been developed and is being implemented at the colleges that will identify remedial courses, students who are enrolled in these courses, and passing rates for these courses. Data on this measure should be available next year.

Recommendation

The data on passing rates for remedial courses should be gathered and analyzed. In addition, efforts should be undertaken to develop a measure of the success of students who pass remedial courses in future college courses.

STUDENT SUCCESS MEASURE H: ***Passing Rates for "General Education" and "Related" Courses***

Background

Student success measures often focus on "end point" measures such as program completion rates, licensure passing rates, and degrees awarded. While these are appropriate measures of student success, they overlook the success of students while they are progressing through a program of study. In addition, these measures often fail to capture students who enroll in a community college and do not have an intent of completing a program.

Passing rates for "General Education" and "related" courses provide a measure of the success of students in progressing through a course of study. These courses are designed to provide students with traditional academic studies (e.g., English, mathematics, social sciences) and are a compliment to the technical and vocational components of their programs. "General Education" and "related" courses can be thought of as that component of a student's program that provides a "well-rounded" education.

Currently it is not possible to compute passing rates for "General Education" and "related" courses. As with Student Success Measure G, passing rates for remedial courses, the appropriate computer programs have been developed and are being implemented that will result in the calculation of passing rates for "General Education" and "related" courses. These rates should be available next year.

Recommendation

The data on passing rates should be collected from the colleges and reported in next year's report.

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR II: RESOURCES

For any institution, educational or industrial, there is a critical mass of resources necessary for the organization to perform at an optimal level. When resources fall below this critical mass level, performance declines and quality suffers. The level of resources can be thought of as an indicator of the health of an organization.

During the 1960s, resources for higher education were readily available. During the past two decades, however, colleges and universities have had to contend with a shrinking availability of resources. The demand by the public for tax relief and reduced state government over the past few years, coupled with some revenue shortfalls, has resulted in ever tightening budgets.

While resources have declined over the past two decades, the demands on community colleges have increased dramatically. Enrollment has continued to increase, with more and more North Carolinians turning to the community colleges for job training and for the first two years of a baccalaureate program. The role of community colleges in literacy education and community services has grown continuously over the years. Colleges are being asked to provide more services to more people with fewer resources.

An examination of the colleges' resources will indicate the capability of the institutions in providing quality educational programs. Whereas resources alone do not guarantee that a quality education will be present; without the appropriate resources a college cannot provide students with an adequate learning experience.

The measures selected as indicators of the health of the system and the colleges as determined by resources are:

A. Average Salaries as a Percent of the Southeastern Regional Average

B. Student/Faculty Ratio

C. Participation in Staff Development Programs: Tier A

D. Currentness of Equipment

E. Percent of Libraries Meeting American Library Association Standards

F. System Funding/FTE

RESOURCES MEASURE A: Institutional Salaries as a Percent of the Southeastern Regional Average

---

Background

This measure is an indicator of a key "input" to education: the personnel who make it happen. While it is true that dedicated people will provide high quality education for low salaries, it is unrealistic to expect that education can continue to attract highly skilled, knowledgeable people who have significantly higher paying alternatives. If these alternatives are in other educational systems—if a dedicated teacher can teach elsewhere for more pay—it is even more unrealistic. In addition, community colleges must compete for technically skilled people in areas like electronics and nursing, in which the relevant labor market is outside education. Measures for market competitiveness of salaries should be developed.

In 1993-94, salary data on administrative positions were available from the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA). The data are based on two-year institutions from across the nation and represent 316 reporting institutions. The median salary for each position is reported.

The Commission on the Future recommended that the North Carolina Community College System raise salaries to the upper quartile of community college salaries in the Southeast. We have chosen to use faculty salaries in the southeastern region as a conservative basis for comparison since these other states are similar to North Carolina in terms of cost of living. Other things to consider include the fact that technical education is a greater part of what community colleges do in North Carolina than elsewhere, even in the South, and that technical personnel are typically more expensive.

Attaining the average is not setting a very high goal, especially since southeastern regional salaries are 92 percent of the national average. Also, the average is a moving target, since it will change when any state makes an effort to raise salaries. This benchmark should be revisited periodically to insure that it is appropriate.

Salaries are not measured or reported consistently between states and the data are confusing. The average monthly salary, including fringes, is considered to be the most comparable figure, since colleges and systems define full-time in various ways. The salary question also involves issues related to longevity: a long-time faculty member may have a higher salary due to seniority, or conversely, it may have been necessary to pay more to get the newest person in a competitive labor market.

Implications

The data indicate that North Carolina remains significantly behind the southeastern regional average for faculty salaries. The impact of low salaries is reflected in colleges losing key personnel, especially to industry, and in not being able to hire their first choice in certain fields.

A recently completed study of faculty and staff in the system provides further evidence of the low status of faculty salaries at North Carolina community colleges (McKay, 1992). Currently North Carolina ranks 46th in the nation in salaries paid to community college faculty. When compared with instructors in the university system, the average salary paid to community college faculty is only 75 percent of the average salary paid to instructors in the UNC system. It should be pointed out that instructors in the university system typically have Masters degrees and thus are comparable in education to the majority of community college faculty.

The North Carolina State Appropriations Bills for 1993-95 includes a special provision in Section 115 entitled "Community College Faculty Salaries." This special provision recognizes that as a system the average full-time faculty salary is above the appropriated unit value ($33,035 versus $32,796), but also recognizes that a significant number (of the colleges in the system) have average full-time faculty salaries below the per unit value. Consequently, the special provision requires that "beginning with the 1993-94 fiscal year, each community college shall pay its full-time curriculum faculty an average salary that is the amount appropriated by the General Assembly for the curriculum unit value in the System's funding formula." Additionally, the State Board of Community Colleges may grant colleges an exemption to this requirement if it finds "sound educational reasons for such an exemption." The State Board of Community Colleges is also required to report, each year by May 1, to the Joint Legislative Commission on Governmental Operations on any exemptions granted under the special provision , including the reasons for the exemptions. In the 1993-94 academic year, half (29 out of 58) of the colleges in the system did not meet this full-time curriculum faculty salary requirement.

The data on administrative salaries shows that the community colleges are behind in most categories. In addition to data on the median administrative salaries for North Carolina compared to the national medians, information is presented on the percent of North Carolina administrators that are above the 60th percentile and also those below the 40 percentile for national salaries. These data indicate that median salaries for administrators in North Carolina, in most categories, is below the 40th percentile for the nation. As with faculty salaries, North Carolina ranks low in administrative salaries.

NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE MEDIAN ADMINISTRATIVE SALARIES COMPARED WITH NATIONAL MEDIANS

EMPLOYEE CATEGORY	CUPA MEDIAN SALARY 1993-94	NC MEDIAN SALARY 1993-94
Executive		
President	$88,398	$88,542
Executive Vice President	74,616	67,056
Academic		
Chief Instructional Officer	$67,669	$56,496
Inst. Research/Planning	47,684	47,172
Administrator-Vocational	55,785	43,494
Administrator-LRC	45,989	42,204
Institutional Research	37,544	35,664
Administrative		
Chief Business Officer	$63,648	$52,968
Admin.-Accounting	46,717	39,276
Supervising-Accounting	37,329	32,208
Mgmt/Plant Operations	46,370	29,772
Admin.-Computer Center	53,073	43,302
Computer Systems Admin.	46,086	31,596
Personnel Officer	50,423	29,904
Purchasing	35,575	26,976
Printing	29,925	18,408
Accounting-low	26,512	19,152
Accounting-high	32,549	23,436
Comp. Programmer-low	29,242	22,218
Comp. Programmer-high	34,490	22,464
External Affairs		
Inst. Development Officer	$43,463	$32,028
Public Information	42,000	28,542
Student Services		
Chief Student Services Officer	$58,930	$48,666
Admin.-Student Services	56,672	43,188
Financial Aid Officer	39,963	30,288
Registrar/Admissions	47,042	30,924

Source: *CUPA Administrative Compensation Survey, 1993-94.*

MEDIAN SALARIES OF NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE AMINISTRATORS AND PERCENT BELOW THE NATIONAL FORTIETH PERCENTILE AND PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL SIXTIETH PERCENTILE IN 1993-94

North Carolina Number	% Below U.S. 40th Percentile	% Above U.S. 60th Percentile	Position Title	U.S. 40th Percentile	U.S. 60th Percentile
58	38%	38%	Chief Executive Officer (President)	$84,266	$92,000
17	71%	6%	Executive Vice President	$70,100	$76,214
50	74%	4%	Chief Business Officer	$60,683	$67,158
17	76%	12%	Administrator-Accounting/Controller	$43,504	$49,310
24	88%	8%	Management/Supervising-Accounting	$36,200	$39,378
21	29%	38%	Mgmt/Research/Devel/Plan/Effect	$43,600	$51,100
53	85%	4%	Chief Instructional Officer	$64,745	$70,862
15	80%	0%	Administrator-Vocational	$53,000	$58,568
35	63%	23%	Administrator-Learning Resources	$43,680	$49,492
44	82%	14%	Chief Student Affairs/Services Officer	$55,900	$62,229
37	89%	3%	Administrator-Student Services	$52,508	$58,843
62	84%	3%	Financial Aid Officer	$36,632	$43,246
53	94%	2%	Registrar/Admissions	$44,552	$50,905
56	98%	0%	Management/Plant Operations	$42,887	$50,100
12	75%	17%	Administrator-Computer Center	$49,150	$58,000
48	94%	4%	Computer Systems Administrator	$41,200	$49,790
18	89%	11%	Institutional Development Officer	$40,925	$44,016
13	54%	46%	Institutional Research	$36,943	$38,120
34	82%	3%	Public Information	$36,934	$46,417
19	100%	0%	Personnel Officer	$44,390	$52,460
18	83%	6%	Purchasing	$33,578	$39,100
51	98%	0%	Printing	$28,250	$31,050
129	94%	1%	Accounting-low	$24,645	$29,244
99	94%	1%	Accounting-high	$31,633	$34,902
58	78%	9%	Computer Programmer-low	$27,310	$30,534
24	92%	8%	Computer Programmer-high	$31,970	$35,706

Source: CUPA Administrative Compensation Survey, 1993-94.

NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY SALARIES AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE SOUTHEAST AVERAGE AND RANK AMONG 15 SOUTHEASTERN STATES

YEAR	NC SALARY	SREB AVE. SALARY	% OF SREB AVE.	RANK
1989-90	$26,800	$31,566	84.9	9th
1990-91*	$25,690	$31,555	81.5	15th
1991-92	$26,014	$32,015	81.3	15th
1992-93	$26,461	$32,302	81.9	14th
1993-94	$27,408	$33,470	81.9	15th

*Reflects change in the method used by SREB to calculate salaries.

Source:* *SREB Fact Book On Higher Education.

Recommendation

Improving salary levels is a major cost item. We should continue to work with the SREB and other agencies to try to establish the monthly salary as the basis for comparison and to develop a consistent approach to collecting and reporting the data. An improved data measure using the CUPA report is currently being investigated and will possibly be implemented in the future. Additionally, alternative benchmarks should also be investigated particularly in terms of market competitiveness.

RESOURCES MEASURE B: Student/Faculty Ratio

Background

A key ingredient to a proper learning situation is the opportunity for interaction between instructor and student. In technical and vocational programs, where much of the teaching is "hands-on," instructors must be able to give individual attention to students in the classroom and in the lab/shop. Unfortunately, as enrollments have increased, many colleges have found that the only way to meet the demand for programs is by increasing class size.

The student/faculty ratio is an indicator of the health of the system. As the student/faculty ratio increases, it is logical to assume that the opportunity for students to receive individual attention decreases. An increasing student/faculty ratio also translates into an increased workload for the faculty for there are more students to teach/supervise and more papers to evaluate. As faculty workload increases, so does faculty "burnout."

An appropriate measure of the student/faculty ratio is currently being developed. In assessing the appropriateness of a student/faculty ratio, individual programs will need to be examined. It is likely that what may be an appropriate student/faculty ratio for a college transfer English class may not be appropriate for a welding class where the instruction is more "hands-on" oriented.

Recommendation

This measure should be developed for reporting in the future. In developing the measure, consideration should be given to the types of programs offered by the system. In addition, comparable data from other systems should be collected.

RESOURCES MEASURE C: Participation in Staff Development Programs: Tier A

Background

Like salaries, participation in staff development programs is an "input" indicator of the quality of teaching. Instructors who stay up-to-date in their field and incorporate new teaching technologies and methods into their delivery provide better quality instruction. Staff development activities also boost morale and creativity. Similar effects are realized by personnel in all classifications.

There is currently no way to measure the level of participation in staff development programs. The only indicator available is participation in "Tier A" programs, which are funded separately and have been restricted to certain types of activities. Prior to 1989-90 only faculty were eligible for Tier A program support. Other staff also need staff development activities. Funding for Tier A has remained at $1.23 million each year over the five years the program has been in effect, thus not improving even to cover inflation. In addition, restrictions on the use of these funds were lifted as part of a flexibility measure to help colleges deal with the budget cuts of the past. Thus, colleges were able to use the funds to meet any legitimate college need.

In the course of normal operations, colleges spend additional dollars and involve personnel in developmental activities which are not covered by these funds. For example, travel funds are typically made available from college operating budgets to enable staff to attend conferences, etc. Colleges also hold on-campus developmental activities not covered with special funds. However, only limited funds are available from operating budgets.

An appropriate measure of participation in staff development programs is currently unavailable. In past years, the number of faculty and staff participating in Tier A sponsored activities has been reported. This data, however, have been very limited in that the type of activity and the quality of activity has not been assessed. Simply looking at participation rates did not provide any information on the activities and impact on college personnel. Indeed, if a college sponsored a mandatory workshop for all personnel, then the college would have a 100 percent participation rate, but it is not necessarily true that the college would have met the staff development needs of its personnel.

Beginning in 1991-92 it was decided to report on the percent of Tier A funds that were expended by the system and by the colleges. Data were collected and reported for the past three years. This data, it was believed, would provide some measure of the college's efforts in providing faculty and staff with staff development activities.

62

Implications

The data indicate that colleges are making use of Tier A money. It is still not possible, however, to determine the impact of the Tier A sponsored activities. It is also not possible to determine from available data the amount of additional funds expended by colleges on staff development activities. Efforts to define a meaningful staff development participation measure should continue.

Data

PERCENTAGE OF TIER A FUNDS EXPENDED FOR FULL- AND PART-TIME FACULTY AND STAFF

YEAR	% OF FUNDS EXPENDED
1989-90	92.47
1990-91	82.94
1991-92	94.58
1992-93	93.88
1993-94	94.88

Source: ***Professional Competencies Program Final Report, Program Services, North Carolina Community College System Office.***

Recommendation

Efforts to develop an appropriate measure of participation in staff development activities should continue. Such a measure should include staff development activities for all staff, not faculty only, and should provide evidence of the extent of involvement, such as hours or days devoted to developmental activities.

PERCENTAGE OF TIER A FUNDS EXPENDED FOR FULL- AND PART-TIME FACULTY AND STAFF, 1993-94

INSTITUTION	FTE	Percent of Funds Spent			
		1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94
<1,000					
Pamlico CC	182	100	100	98	93
Montgomery CC	662	56	53	91	97
Tri-County CC	669	73	74	100	100
Bladen CC	672	88	77	93	99
McDowell TCC	772	100	83	100	100
Martin CC	928	100	99	94	92
Brunswick CC	949	100	90	91	53
Anson CC	951	53	64	74	80
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960	81	100	100	93
1,000-1,999					
Mayland CC	1,033	47	96	100	100
James Sprunt CC	1,124	84	98	95	100
Sampson CC	1,268	96	100	89	100
Piedmont CC	1,278	91	87	94	99
Carteret CC	1,289	85	99	100	100
Haywood CC	1,359	100	99	71	100
Nash CC	1,390	86	100	99	98
Wilson TCC	1,405	98	68	100	100
Mitchell CC	1,406	95	100	100	99
Cleveland CC	1,464	67	100	100	100
Halifax CC	1,473	83	97	73	78
Isothermal CC	1,495	69	98	95	96
Southwestern CC	1,495	77	94	99	100
Blue Ridge CC	1,500	82	100	100	100
College of The Albemarle	1,504	52	100	100	100
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	100	98	99	81
Stanly CC	1,517	88	100	99	100
Richmond CC	1,522	100	75	67	75
Randolph CC	1,624	60	100	100	100
Edgecombe CC	1,647	100	87	80	71
Rockingham CC	1,670	54	96	93	98
Southeastern CC	1,717	100	87	86	100
Wilkes CC	1,740	91	100	99	100
Robeson CC	1,794	99	97	100	98
Craven CC	1,980	66	99	99	94
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	66	96	95	100
2,000-2,999					
Lenoir CC	2,161	99	100	100	99
Davidson Co. CC	2,165	100	72	98	100
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	100	100	100	97
Surry CC	2,342	78	97	59	100
Alamance CC	2,522	100	100	89	100
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	100	100	100	100
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	77	99	94	92
Wayne CC	2,680	94	100	100	98
Johnston CC	2,706	82	94	88	94
Sandhills CC	2,839	69	100	100	99
Catawba Valley CC	2,948	91	90	98	90
3,000-4,999					
Central Carolina CC	3,062	90	89	92	92
Cape Fear CC	3,080	85	89	99	100
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	56	100	100	100
Durham TCC	3,170	100	90	100	100
Pitt CC	3,260	50	84	91	80
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	93	100	93	100
Gaston CC	3,588	67	100	100	96
Forsyth TCC	4,099	77	100	100	100
>4,999					
Guilford TCC	5,366	100	100	94	88
Wake TCC	5,732	100	100	100	100
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	57	NO FUNDING	77	82
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	94	100	100	100
System	129,877	83	95	94	95

Background

If colleges are to prepare students for the increasingly complex technological demands of the workplace, equipment that is appropriate to the skills students need to develop must be made available. It is not possible to adequately prepare workers for 21st century jobs using 20th century technology. A key component of fostering a "culture of quality" at community college institutions is the availability of equipment that is appropriate to the skills being taught.

Manufacturing today is very different from a decade ago, involving more automated processes that are computer driven. Today's worker must be skilled in this new technology if the needs of business and industry are to be met.

To assess the availability of appropriate equipment in the community college system, data were examined on the age of equipment in use in the system. The assumption underlying this analysis is that the development of skills needed in today's workplace requires experience with and knowledge of equipment that is current and up-to-date.

Implications

Data were collected on the age of equipment currently in use in the community college system. As can be seen from the data below, 80 percent of all equipment currently in use in the system is more than five years old, and 47 percent of that equipment is more than ten years old. It can be seen further from the data that equipment is aging at a faster rate than new equipment is being purchased. This information, coupled with the fact that 95 percent of the equipment has a depreciating life of five to seven years, suggests that an unacceptably high proportion of the equipment being used for training in the system is either obsolete or on the verge of obsolescence.

Data

PERCENT OF EQUIPMENT IN EACH AGE CATEGORY

YEAR	0-5 YEARS	6-10 YEARS	> 10 YEARS
1989-90	34	31	35
1990-91	31	34	35
1991-92	25	37	38
1992-93	24	35	41
1993-94	20	33	47

Source: ***Equipment Database, Facility and Property Services, NC Community College System Office.***

Recommendation

The five year trend in the aging of equipment in the community college system should serve as a "red flag." Over a five year period, the percent of equipment that was more than 5 years old increased from 66 percent to 80 percent. With the technological advances over the past 5 years, such an increase in aging equipment should be cause for concern on the part of the community college system. Further studies need to be conducted to determine the impact that aging equipment has on the ability of community colleges to appropriately train students for the workplace.

This measure should continue to be developed and refined. Future development should focus not just on the age of the equipment, but on the match between the equipment being used in training and the skills needed by workers in the various occupations.

RESOURCES MEASURE E: Percent of Libraries Meeting American Library Association Standards

---

Background

Like current equipment, up-to-date libraries or learning resource centers are a key measure of the health of educational institutions. They provide the resources needed by students of all levels in the pursuit of education to support their classroom efforts.

The American Library Association (ALA) has adopted standards for learning resource centers at community, junior and technical colleges. Based on an institution's full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment, the standards establish "minimum" and "excellent" levels for various areas of the learning resource centers (e.g., staff, collections, budget). In effect, ALA has established a "yardstick" by which an institution, or a system, can measure the adequacy of its library resources.

Using the ALA standards, data on the system libraries were collected and analyzed. The purpose of the analysis was to determine what percent of the institutions meet the ALA standards at either the "minimum" or "excellent" level. Only those factors in the standards for which data were readily available were included in the analysis. Data related to services are not now available and therefore were not included in this analysis.

Implications

Data on library operating expenditures, serial holdings, book collection size, library staff, and square footage of facilities were collected on each college. This information was compared with the "minimum" and "excellent" levels defined by ALA for each measure. It is important to note that different levels are specified for each measure depending on the size of the college as measured by FTE. In conducting the analysis, colleges were matched with the levels specified for their FTE. Though the standards do not differentiate between FTE and curriculum FTE, such a differentiation was made in this analysis. That is, our colleges were matched with the FTE level for each measure based on their curriculum FTE, not total FTE. The result of this approach is to make the most favorable judgment of our library resources, since in fact our learning resource centers must also serve the non-curriculum students.

The data indicate that the majority of the system's libraries do not meet the "minimum" levels specified by ALA, though progress has been made. In 1992-93, 15 colleges met the minimum level and 1 college met the excellent level for number of book titles. This increased in 1993-94 to 15 meeting the minimum level and 2 meeting the excellent level. The most dramatic change occurred in serial subscriptions with the number of colleges meeting the minimum level increasing from 17 in 1992-93 to 30 in 1993-94. Improvements were also noted in the areas of expenditure per FTE, library staff, and square footage.

Data

LEARNING RESOURCE CENTERS: COMPLIANCE WITH ACRL STANDARDS

MEASURE	BELOW STANDARD		MINIMUM LEVEL		EXCELLENT LEVEL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
# of Book Titles	41	71	15	26	2	3
Serial Subscriptions	28	48	30	52	0	0
Expenditure per FTE Minus Salaries	56	97	2	3	0	0
Library Staff	48	83	9	16	1	2
Square Footage	58	0	0	0	0	0

***Source:* Planning and Research, NC Community College System Office.**

Recommendation

In 1992-93 the General Assembly doubled the appropriations for libraries at community colleges. This measure should be monitored carefully in the future to determine improvements in the number of colleges that do meet the ALA standards.

This measure should continue to be refined. Data on the number of services provided by each college's learning resource center should be collected. The appropriateness of the facilities measure (square footage of library) should be closely examined to determine its usefulness in assessing the quality of the system's libraries.

RESOURCES MEASURE F: System Funding/FTE

Background

System funding/FTE can be thought of as the basis for all other resources available at a community college. It is the funding that makes possible adequate salaries for faculty, the purchase of equipment, the enhancement of libraries, and the means by which to offer staff development activities. Quite naturally, a high level of funding does not ensure that the appropriate resources will be available at colleges; the funds must be managed properly for this to occur. However, without an appropriate level of funding, other resources cannot be secured.

This measure was developed to indicate the trend in system funding/FTE over the past five years and to compare this trend with national data. As available information was analyzed, however, it was found that the data were not available in a form that made comparisons possible. For the system, the most reliable data found were on average cost per FTE. This data provides a measure of expended allocations for the year as a function of FTE.

On the national level, a consistent, comparative statistic was not available. The National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) does publish information on state appropriations per credit FTE student, but this information is based on a sample of community colleges rather than on the system. In addition, NACUBO reports a State Median statistic and a Mean of Medians statistic on the data. At this point it is unclear as to the usefulness and generalizability of these data. Because of the uncertain nature of the national data, only state data are being reported.

Implications

The data show that prior to 1991-92, average cost/FTE increased steadily, yet moderately. In 1991-92, however, average cost/FTE declined to a level below that of 1988-89. The decline in average cost/FTE in 1991-92 is probably reflective of measures taken by the state in trying to balance the budget in a very difficult year. In 1991-92, the June pay date for many state workers was moved to July, thus making the funds come from the next fiscal year. As a result, 1991-92 for many state workers had an 11-month pay period rather than a 12-month pay period. This explanation is supported further when it is noted that average cost/FTE increased significantly in 1992-93 over 1991-92. The average cost/FTE did increase again in 1993-94. Part of this increase was a result of the state moving the June pay date from July 1 back to June 30, thus correcting the action that had been taken in 1991-92 as noted above. This resulted in a 13-month pay period for most state workers in 1993-94

Data

AVERAGE COST PER FTE FOR THE NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

YEAR	AVERAGE COST/FTE
1989-90	$3,073.15
1990-91	$3,144.02
1991-92	$2,900.96
1992-93	$3,300.47
1993-94	$4,033.49

Source: ***Annual Financial Report, Auditing and Accounting, NC Community College System Office.***

Recommendation

Efforts should be undertaken to refine this measure. A measure of system funding/FTE should be developed. Comparative data on SREB states and on the national level should be sought.

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR III: ACCESS

At the core of the community college system's mission is its open door policy. Community colleges "take people from where they are to where they want to be" in the words of founding father Dallas Herring. The special mission of community colleges is to serve those who did not have opportunities to learn or who missed out on those opportunities, and to serve people who have special problems to overcome. Thus, there is an emphasis on reaching out to the underserved: dropouts, handicapped, economically or educationally disadvantaged and other groups who are not traditionally included in higher education.

There are many issues facing community colleges today, but perhaps none strike at the core of our mission as hard as does the reality of limited resources in this time of economic uncertainty. How long can the "open door" remain open when classes are filled to overflowing? As the demand for services continues to rise without a corresponding increase in resources, the "open door" that is the path to opportunity for so many closes just a little bit more.

The Commission on the Future stressed the importance to the state of bringing underserved groups into education. The state needs to raise the productivity of its citizens, and these are times in which people have a harder time being self-sufficient and raising families unless they have an education. Providing access to education, a constitutional duty of the state in North Carolina, is more and more important to individuals and to society. A successful community college system will be reaching out to underserved groups.

The measures selected to indicate how well the community college system is performing this role are:

A. Enrollment of High School Dropouts; Handicapped; Disadvantaged; Single Parents; Nontraditional High School Diploma Earners; Inmates

B. Number Served by Type Through Literacy Programs and Percent of Target Population Served

C. Number and Percent of Dropouts Annually Who are Served by Literacy Programs

D. Percent of Students Receiving Financial Aid and Amount of Aid Compared With Cost of Attendance

E. Percent of Population in Service Area Enrolled

ACCESS MEASURE A: *Enrollment of High School Dropouts; Handicapped; Disadvantaged; Single Parents; Nontraditional High School Diploma Earners; Inmates*

Background

The degree to which education is being delivered to the groups which need additional opportunities is a direct way to measure access. A simple accounting of the numbers of students with particular characteristics and/or needs is one such indicator.

In the fall of 1989, the system began to collect data on these target groups enrolled in all programs. Colleges have been required to report in these categories for programs supported by the Vocational Education Act. Data about enrollees in literacy programs also have been collected because of the federal funding of those programs. The data shown here apply only to the literacy programs and programs funded by the federal Vocational Education Act. They do not include all community college students and, therefore, are not generalizable. Definitions of the categories are given with the data.

It should be noted that prior to 1989-90, students could not be enrolled in literacy programs if they already possessed a high school diploma. Therefore, the total enrollment of these programs could be considered to be high school dropouts. Since the policy change in 1989-90, enrollment numbers of dropouts in literacy were not consistently available. In 1991-92, the appropriate data elements were added to the Extension Registration file to identify whether or not a student was a high school dropout. This information, along with information generated from the Literacy Education Information System, allows for the reporting of dropouts enrolled in literacy.

It should also be noted that it is not legal to require students to supply information that would categorize them (as handicapped or economically disadvantaged, etc.) though they may be requested to supply such information. Changes in the magnitude of the data from year to year might reflect the willingness or unwillingness of students to supply the information requested.

Implications

Community colleges are serving target groups in literacy and vocational programs funded with federal dollars. However, because the data are reported only on those students who are directly benefiting from the federal funds, the data are not inclusive and therefore have uncertain value as an indicator for all community college enrollments. The voluntary nature of the data also makes it suspect, especially for economically disadvantaged and handicapped. Measure B provides more insight into the literacy programs' service to the target groups.

Definitions

HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT, a student who leaves a school for any reason except death, before graduation or completion of a program of study, and without transferring to another school.

HANDICAPPED, persons who are sixteen years of age and older with any type of physical or mental impairment that substantially limits or restricts one or more major life activities, including walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, learning, and working. This definition includes adults who are alcohol and drug abusers, mentally retarded, hearing-impaired, deaf, speech-impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, other health impairments, and adults with specific learning disabilities.

MENTALLY RETARDED ADULTS, adults with documented mental retardation who may benefit from the program. These adults may not have attended public school, attended on a limited basis, or who simply need additional educational opportunities after leaving public school.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS, adults who receive financial assistance from Federal, State, and/or local programs, such as Aid For Dependent Children, old-age assistance, general assistance, and aid to the blind or totally disabled. Social Security recipients should not be included in this category unless they are receiving old-age assistance.

INMATES, adults who are inmates in any prison, jail reformatory, work farm, detention center, or halfway house, community-based rehabilitation center, or any other similar Federal, State or local institution designed for the confinement or rehabilitation of criminal offenders.

Source: ***Annual Performance Report for Literacy Programs, Student Development Services, NC Community College System Office.***

The large increase in the number of public assistance recipients enrolled in the literacy program in 1989-90 may have been the result of the implementation of the new welfare program, JOBS. At this point it is not known why the number of public assistance recipients served dropped by such a large number in 1990-91 and increased dramatically again in 1991-92. It may be a problem related to data entry and the new Literacy Education Information System. The reason for the large fluctuations over the past five years in the number of handicapped students is unknown. This may reflect data collection efforts at the colleges or the willingness of students to report this information.

Data

SYSTEM LEVEL ENROLLMENTS IN THE LITERACY PROGRAM

HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS	1988-89	104,785
	1989-92	(data not avail.)
	1992-93	115,127
	1993-94	104,125
HANDICAPPED	1989-90	14,487
	1990-91	23,035
	1991-92	19,149
	1992-93	12,232
	1993-94	14,649
MENTALLY RETARDED ADULTS	1989-90	8,391
	1990-91	8,147
	1991-92	9,336
	1992-93	6,394
	1993-94	7,172
PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS	1989-90	14,825
	1990-91	8,081
	1991-92	11,324
	1992-93	11,759
	1993-94	11,889
HOMELESS	1990-91	1,728
	1991-92	2,250
	1992-93	2,982
	1993-94	2,326
INMATES	1989-90	10,048
	1990-91	8,093
	1991-92	11,426
	1992-93	12,585
	1993-94	12,763

SYSTEM LEVEL ENROLLMENTS IN THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM—STUDENTS ASSISTED WITH CARL PERKINS FUNDS

DISABLED	1989-90	9,242
	1990-91	6,730
	1991-92	4,236
	1992-93	4,306
	1993-94	4,208
DISADVANTAGED	1989-90	59,876
	1990-91	48,772
	1991-92	32,745
	1992-93	39,710
	1993-94	47,436
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	1989-90	3,674
	1990-91	2,499
	1991-92	876
	1992-93	1,821
	1993-94	1,841
CORRECTIONS	1989-90	1,524
	1990-91	2,282
	1991-92	2,714
	1992-93	3,681
	1993-94	3,970

Definitions

DISABLED, when applied to individuals, means individuals who are mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech or language impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, other health impaired, deaf-blind, multi-handicapped, or persons with specific learning disabilities, who by reason thereof require special education and related services, and who because of their handicapping condition, cannot succeed in the regular vocational education program without special education assistance.

DISADVANTAGED means individuals (other than handicapped individuals) who have economic or academic disadvantages and who require special services and assistance in order to enable them to succeed in vocational education programs. The term includes individuals who are members of economically disadvantaged families, migrants, individuals who have limited English proficiency and individuals who are dropouts from, or who are identified as potential dropouts from, secondary school.

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY, when used with reference to individuals, means individuals—(1) Who were not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English; (1.b) Who came from environments where a language other than English is dominant; or (1.c) Who are American Indian and Alaskan Native students and who come from environments where a language other than English has had a significant impact on their level of English language proficiency; and (2) Who by reason thereof, have sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language to deny those individuals the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English or to participate fully in our society.

CORRECTIONS (CRIMINAL OFFENDER), means any individual who is charged with or convicted of any criminal offense, including a youth offender or a juvenile offender.

Source: ***Annual Performance Report for the Vocational Education State Administered Program, NC Community College System Office.***

Recommendation

The revised data collection processes that went into effect in the fall of 1989 should provide better data for target group enrollment in the future. It will take some experience with these data to understand how well they measure the ability of the colleges to address the needs of the underserved. Where possible, data on the numbers of people in the target groups within the relevant population should also be shown. It may be possible to get new census data by zip code so that service areas can be analyzed. We hope the student progress monitoring system can help us track the transition of students into curriculum programs. Qualitative studies (i.e., focus groups) could give a good picture of how target groups are received on campus and what factors support their success.

ACCESS MEASURE B: Number Served by Type Through Literacy Programs and Percent of Target Population Served

---

Background

The underserved are especially likely to need literacy programs. This measure is intended to show to what extent the various types of literacy programs are providing services to the undereducated citizens who need them.

Enrollment in literacy programs is compared to the number in the target group, defined as the 1,416,966 adult North Carolinians, aged 16 or over, who have completed less than 12 grades of schooling (for those individuals 16 to 19 there is the additional requirement that they are not enrolled in school). This definition of the target group is an underestimate of those who need literacy programs since it does not include people who have spent years in school but whose skills do not measure up to the grade level they completed.

There now exist several different reports that present literacy data on the system. Each report is developed according to specific guidelines and therefore may report the data differently. For example, one report focuses on the last literacy program in which a student was enrolled during the year. Whereas the total number of literacy students being served would not change, the numbers of students in each literacy category would, depending on when the report was generated.

In order to maintain consistency in the reporting of participation rates in literacy, data from the Annual Statistical Report published by the Community College System Office are reported. This report is considered to be the official source of system statistics generated from institutional data sent by the colleges. As a result of changing to one standard data source, the data for past years will not match previous critical success factors reports on this measure. A more valid comparison of the data from year to year should be possible by consistently using this one source of data.

Whereas the system data are duplicated across literacy categories, the available data on individual institutions were unduplicated and represented the **last** program in which a student was enrolled during 1993-94. The reporting of the data in this manner may make it difficult for some colleges to match the data presented in this report with their own data since it is likely that the data at the college level are duplicated across type. The total enrollment in literacy for 1993-94 should be the same as the total unduplicated headcount in literacy kept by the college.

Implications

In 1993-94, enrollments in adult literacy programs showed a small decline. This decline in enrollment is consistent with the overall decline in curriculum programs during the same time period. The reason for the decline is unknown, but is possibly related to the declining unemployment rate and stronger economy during 1993-94. Historically, during periods of low unemployment and a strong economy, enrollment in community colleges has decreased. It should be noted that, even with the small decline in 1993-94, enrollment in literacy programs have increased significantly over the past five years.

The data illustrate the important role that the community colleges play in serving the nontraditional student. By providing literacy programs to such a large number of people, the community colleges are preparing more individuals with the basic skills necessary to enter the labor market or to pursue further education.

Data

ADULT LITERACY PROGRAM ENROLLMENTS BY TYPE
(Duplicated Across Type)

YEAR	ABE	AHSP	GED	CED	TOTAL	% TARGET POP.
1989-90	64,869	19,229	23,911	8,731	109,415	6.3
1990-91	73,535	20,549	25,844	8,436	120,043	8.5
1991-92	77,005	20,955	29,258	8,137	125,660	8.8
1992-93	79,358	20,481	29,461	7,989	126,267	8.9
1993-94	77,331	18,844	26,429	7,330	122,996	8.7

Definitions

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION (ABE), a program of basic skills for adults, 16 or older, who are no longer enrolled in high school and score at 8.9 or below on tests approved by the Community College System Office. This includes English as a Second Language students.

ADULT HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM (AHSP), a program of instruction designed to help adult students earn a high school diploma.

GENERAL EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (GED), a program of instruction designed to prepare adult students to pass the GED tests in order to qualify for a high school equivalency diploma.

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION (CED), a program to provide services to those mentally retarded adults who have not had an education or who received an inadequate one.

Source: ***Annual Statistical Report, Information Services,***
NC Community College System Office.

Recommendation

Data on enrollments in literacy programs should continue to be collected. The data should be further analyzed to determine the characteristics of the students being served by literacy in order to estimate the impact of these programs on the workforce. Finally, efforts to fully implement the Literacy Education Information System should continue in order to track students through literacy programs and into the workforce or other educational programs.

ADULT LITERACY PROGRAM ENROLLMENTS BY TYPE, 1993-94

INSTITUTION	FTE	ABE	AHS	CED	ESL	GED	TOTAL	1990 CENSUS % POP
<1,000								
Pamlico CC	182	112	0	54	48	45	259	9.05
Montgomery CC	662	286	0	23	156	232	697	9.36
Tri-County CC	669	315	0	45	2	34	396	3.90
Bladen CC	672	195	46	24	51	92	408	4.71
McDowell TCC	772	501	0	197	118	175	991	9.16
Martin CC	928	768	52	66	152	109	1,147	9.29
Brunswick CC	949	265	0	88	64	212	629	5.43
Anson CC	951	1,121	0	44	71	176	1,412	8.98
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960	527	0	63	3	69	662	5.14
1,000-1,999								
Mayland CC	1,033	754	1	101	170	222	1,248	9.42
James Sprunt CC	1,124	668	0	72	420	117	1,277	10.38
Sampson CC	1,268	637	38	140	176	168	1,159	9.11
Piedmont CC	1,278	1,119	223	61	44	166	1,613	10.73
Carteret CC	1,289	260	135	115	64	328	902	9.38
Haywood CC	1,359	333	2	103	21	217	676	5.90
Nash CC	1,390	1,006	182	40	368	260	1,856	9.69
Wilson TCC	1,405	966	87	81	53	315	1,502	8.72
Mitchell CC	1,406	1,213	70	96	164	123	1,666	7.24
Cleveland CC	1,464	384	937	62	22	23	1,428	6.46
Halifax CC	1,473	1,138	0	40	9	126	1,313	5.50
Isothermal CC	1,495	455	885	168	29	210	1,747	8.52
Southwestern CC	1,495	795	0	68	19	94	976	6.47
Blue Ridge CC	1,500	545	0	155	117	717	1,534	8.36
College of The Albemarle	1,504	931	95	82	85	670	1,863	7.88
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	597	0	140	166	176	1,079	7.36
Stanly CC	1,517	1,019	628	66	137	335	2,185	9.44
Richmond CC	1,522	2,430	249	126	0	469	3,174	15.17
Randolph CC	1,624	657	347	82	223	487	1,796	6.04
Edgecombe CC	1,647	816	232	76	68	937	2,129	13.13
Rockingham CC	1,670	1,225	6	56	34	477	1,798	7.03
Southeastern CC	1,717	886	374	102	56	137	1,555	11.11
Wilkes CC	1,740	792	281	167	178	100	1,518	4.91
Robeson CC	1,794	1,200	474	77	83	66	1,900	6.38
Craven CC	1,980	324	78	111	74	798	1,385	10.36
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	723	193	331	215	907	2,369	10.43
2,000-2,999								
Lenoir CC	2,161	1,630	190	187	152	381	2,540	11.37
Davidson Co. CC	2,165	1,127	767	77	99	347	2,417	6.10
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	1,450	568	106	65	386	2,575	8.95
Surry CC	2,342	814	0	125	233	602	1,774	6.22
Alamance CC	2,522	990	347	238	321	741	2,637	10.44
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	1,489	26	168	85	838	2,606	7.40
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	996	578	174	155	204	2,107	4.14
Wayne CC	2,680	1,151	835	112	147	255	2,500	11.96
Johnston CC	2,706	564	446	113	204	99	1,426	6.86
Sandhills CC	2,839	1,073	0	112	281	565	2,031	11.21
Catawba Valley CC	2,948	1,040	3	123	609	814	2,589	6.97
3,000-4,999								
Central Carolina CC	3,062	1,520	661	232	1,087	601	4,101	12.23
Cape Fear CC	3,080	678	489	180	340	143	1,830	6.94
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	1,281	0	146	155	857	2,439	6.27
Durham TCC	3,170	1,043	909	232	1,220	213	3,617	9.61
Pitt CC	3,260	1,310	48	31	192	423	2,004	10.12
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	2,105	149	65	307	957	3,583	23.82
Gaston CC	3,588	2,573	696	71	34	440	3,814	6.04
Forsyth TCC	4,099	1,611	523	241	494	835	3,704	6.96
>4,999								
Guilford TCC	5,366	1,877	549	293	593	679	3,991	6.62
Wake TCC	5,732	3,468	411	277	1,715	1,799	7,670	16.83
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	2,769	1,038	219	861	265	5,152	14.96
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	2,727	1,830	324	1,301	566	6,748	9.66
System	129,877	61,249	16,678	7,168	14,310	22,799	122,204	8.62

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACCESS MEASURE C: Number and Percent of Dropouts Annually Who are Served by Literacy Programs

---

Background

New and emerging technologies in the workplace have reshaped the concept of basic skills. Basic skills are no longer limited to fundamental reading, writing, and computational skills. Today's workers need to possess communication skills, problem solving skills, and critical thinking skills. It is estimated that the educational demands of today's jobs will require a minimum of 13 years of education.

Whereas twenty years ago high school dropouts could find employment in many areas of industry; the changing technology of today's workplace has eliminated many of these low-skilled occupations. High school dropouts are finding that all but the most menial of jobs are beyond their reach. As technology increases, the jobs available for high school dropouts decreases. As more dropouts find themselves closed out of the job market, more will become dependent on public assistance or will become involved in crime.

The community colleges serve as a safety net for many students. Today's high school dropout has the opportunity to pursue education and job training by enrolling in a community college. By providing an "open door," the community colleges are giving students who have not been successful in the traditional education track a second chance.

Prior to 1991-92 data were not available at the system level to determine the success of the colleges in enrolling recent high school dropouts. Data existed that documented the number of high school dropouts that were being served, but the data did not allow a determination of when students dropped out of high school. In 1991-92, however, changes were made in the Curriculum Registration and Extension Registration data files to include last year of high school attended.

To determine the number of recent dropouts served by literacy programs, an analysis of the 1993-94 curriculum and extension data tapes was conducted. The analysis resulted in data on the number of students who enrolled in a community college during 1993-94 and who had left high school without completing between January 1, 1993 and June 30, 1994.

Implication

Though the data indicate that the colleges are enrolling a significant number of recent high school dropouts, it is not currently possible to determine the percentage of high school dropouts being served. Data are not available on the number of high school students who left high school without completing, whether from dropping out or transferring to a community college, during the time period 1/1/93 to 6/30/94.

The data for 1993-94 demonstrate the important "second chance" role that community colleges play for many youths in North Carolina. By providing students who have been unsuccessful, for whatever reasons, in traditional secondary schools with another opportunity to gain the skills they need to enter the workforce or pursue additional education, North Carolina's community colleges are helping ensure the economic viability of the state.

Data

NUMBER OF HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS WHO ENROLLED IN A LITERACY PROGRAM

YEAR DROPPED OUT OF HIGH SCHOOL	YEAR ENROLLED IN A COMMUNITY COLLEGE	NUMBER ENROLLED
1/1/91 - 6/30/92	1991-92	6,306
1/1/92 - 6/30/93	1992-93	11,418
1/1/93 - 6/30/94	1993-94	12,502

Source: ***Statistical Service Section, Information Services, NC Community College System Office.***

Recommendation

The data present a limited measure of the success of the community colleges in serving as a safety net for recent high school dropouts. This measure should be further refined. In particular, data need to be collected on the number of students who left high school without completing, whether by dropping out or transferring to a community college, for each year. This data will enable the calculation of the percent of high school dropouts served by literacy programs. In addition, data need to be collected on this measure for several years to determine any improvements in the number of high school dropouts being served.

NUMBER OF HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS DURING 1993-94 WHO ENROLLED IN A LITERACY PROGRAM AT A COMMUNITY COLLEGE DURING 1993-94

INSTITUTION	FTE	# ENROLLED
<1,000		
Pamlico CC	182	23
Montgomery CC	662	39
Tri-County CC	669	59
Bladen CC	672	50
McDowell TCC	772	59
Martin CC	928	142
Brunswick CC	949	71
Anson CC	951	110
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960	66
1,000-1,999		
Mayland CC	1,033	192
James Sprunt CC	1,124	67
Sampson CC	1,268	52
Piedmont CC	1,278	134
Carteret CC	1,289	117
Haywood CC	1,359	38
Nash CC	1,390	155
Wilson TCC	1,405	154
Mitchell CC	1,406	233
Cleveland CC	1,464	140
Halifax CC	1,473	151
Isothermal CC	1,495	227
Southwestern CC	1,495	245
Blue Ridge CC	1,500	300
College of The Albemarle	1,504	314
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	82
Stanly CC	1,517	300
Richmond CC	1,522	522
Randolph CC	1,624	181
Edgecombe CC	1,647	346
Rockingham CC	1,670	152
Southeastern CC	1,717	226
Wilkes CC	1,740	164
Robeson CC	1,794	197
Craven CC	1,980	264
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	271
2,000-2,999		
Lenoir CC	2,161	321
Davidson Co. CC	2,165	189
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	293
Surry CC	2,342	179
Alamance CC	2,522	271
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	484
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	166
Wayne CC	2,680	269
Johnston CC	2,706	106
Sandhills CC	2,839	184
Catawba Valley CC	2,948	143
3,000-4,999		
Central Carolina CC	3,062	427
Cape Fear CC	3,080	288
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	222
Durham TCC	3,170	278
Pitt CC	3,260	261
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	348
Gaston CC	3,588	579
Forsyth TCC	4,099	242
>4,999		
Guilford TCC	5,366	442
Wake TCC	5,732	458
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	611
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	49
System	129,877	12,653

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACCESS MEASURE D: ***Percent of Students Receiving Financial Aid and Amount of Aid Compared with Cost of Attendance***

Background

Financial need is a major barrier to participation in higher education, especially since a student not only has to pay the cost of tuition, fees, books, transportation and perhaps child care, but also gives up time that could be spent working to earn money. Without help, many students, particularly those with family responsibilities, cannot stay in school. The intent of this measure is to show how far financial aid goes in helping to overcome this barrier for the most needy people in the state.

In calculating the percent of students receiving financial aid, only curriculum students were examined since continuing education students and literacy students are not eligible for the types of financial aid for which data are available. Further, special credit students, co-op students, and dual enrollment students were omitted from the analysis since they also are not eligible for the types of financial aid for which data are available.

Implications

The data show that the numbers of students receiving some aid decreased slightly in 1993-94, but the average dollar value of the aid received increased significantly. Whereas the total number of students receiving financial aid has declined slightly, the percent of students receiving aid is relatively unchanged. State and private sector scholarship funds have been a priority of the State Board of Community Colleges and have been increased. The data do not show the percent of students in need who received aid nor whether the amount of aid was adequate.

Data

PERCENT OF NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS RECEIVING FINANCIAL AID *

YEAR	NUMBER OF CURRICULUM STUDENTS RECEIVING FINANCIAL AID	PERCENT OF CURRICULUM STUDENTS RECEIVING FINANCIAL AID	AVERAGE DOLLAR VALUE
1989-90	43,465	31.8	720.00
1990-91	51,615	35.0	728.00
1991-92	59,224	36.9	834.00
1992-93	67,347	40.2	849.00
1993-94	66,222	39.5	985.37

*Financial aid includes college work study, Pell grants, loans, scholarships, grants, and awards provided. Beginning in 1990-91 nursing awards and loans were included in the data.

Source: ***Statistical Abstract of Higher Education in North Carolina, UNC General Administration.***

Recommendation

At this point a system measure on the average cost of attending a community college is not available. Based on analyses conducted by Student Development Services, an estimated cost of attending four quarters ranges from $3,813 for students (non-nursing) living with parents and no dependents to $8,186 for students in the Associate Degree Nursing program with dependents. Refinement to the measure of cost of attending needs to continue.

Additional refinements in this measure should include a comparison of the percent of students receiving aid to the percent of students who are economically disadvantaged, a differentiation between loans and grants, and the development of a way to say something about the amount of aid students are receiving compared to cost. A study should be undertaken to determine the impact of tuition increases on traditionally underserved students.

ACCESS MEASURE E: Percent of Population in Service Area Enrolled

---

Background

The open door policy of the community college system was established to ensure educational opportunities for all adults in North Carolina. The wide range of educational programs offered and the geographic distribution of the colleges across the state should provide for maximum accessibility by the adult population. Currently, every North Carolinian is within 30 miles of a community college, center or campus.

One measure of the extent to which the system is addressing the educational needs of the state is the percent of the population in the service area enrolled. This measure reflects the accessibility of the programs, and to some degree the appropriateness of the programs. This measure does not, however, provide information on specific target groups being served. At any given college, other limitations may come into play. For example, colleges which have not been able to build new facilities or arrange suitable sharing or lease agreements cannot start classes for which there may be a strong community demand. Indeed, many colleges report that they are utilizing all available space on their campus and are still not able to meet student demands for classes.

The most important limitation on enrollment growth in the current environment is probably funds availability. Colleges have strong incentives to maximize enrollments, but budget reversions and lack of expansion funds ultimately force reductions in the numbers of classes which can be offered.

Implications

Enrollment data for each college (a total of both curriculum and extension headcount) were compared with the adult population of the service area. The percentages served by each college were then averaged to produce a result which can be thought of as the percent of the adult population of the service area enrolled in the typical community college. Since the community college system traditionally enrolls adults, only the population of the service area 18 years old or older was included in the analysis.

The percent of the adult population in the service area served by the community college system declined in 1993-94. As stated earlier in this report, 1993-94 was a year of low unemployment and a stronger economy for North Carolina. Traditionally, during these periods of "prosperity," enrollment in community college programs declines. A one year decline in enrollment should not be considered alarming, but should indicate a need to watch enrollment trends over the next several years.

Data

PERCENT OF ADULT POPULATION IN SERVICE AREA ENROLLED PER COLLEGE (STATE AVERAGE)

YEAR	% OF SERVICE AREA POPULATION ENROLLED (SYSTEM AVE. PER COLLEGE)
1989-90	15.7
1990-91	16.0
1991-92	15.8
1992-93	15.8
1993-94	13.9

Source: ***Annual Enrollment Report**, Information Services,*
NC Community College System Office.

Recommendation

Efforts should be made to determine the extent to which reversions, budget reductions and tuition increases have affected enrollment by various target groups. In addition, data should be collected on the number of classes that had to be cancelled and on enrollment limits that had to be set due to recent reversions and budget reductions.

PERCENT OF ADULT POPULATION IN SERVICE AREA ENROLLED, 1993-94

INSTITUTION	FTE	% OF POP
<1,000		
Pamlico CC	182	14.6
Montgomery CC	662	20.2
Tri-County CC	669	13.2
Bladen CC	672	14.7
McDowell TCC	772	18.8
Martin CC	928	19.8
Brunswick CC	949	9.5
Anson CC	951	7.0
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960	10.1
1,000-1,999		
Mayland CC	1,033	17.1
James Sprunt CC	1,124	18.4
Sampson CC	1,268	16.6
Piedmont CC	1,278	18.2
Carteret CC	1,289	17.2
Haywood CC	1,359	12.4
Nash CC	1,390	16.5
Wilson TCC	1,405	18.0
Mitchell CC	1,406	11.6
Cleveland CC	1,464	12.3
Halifax CC	1,473	16.1
Isothermal CC	1,495	15.9
Southwestern CC	1,495	14.2
Blue Ridge CC	1,500	11.4
College of The Albemarle	1,504	9.8
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	15.1
Stanly CC	1,517	9.2
Richmond CC	1,522	15.3
Randolph CC	1,624	12.1
Edgecombe CC	1,647	19.1
Rockingham CC	1,670	14.4
Southeastern CC	1,717	19.7
Wilkes CC	1,740	14.3
Robeson CC	1,794	14.6
Craven CC	1,980	18.0
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	19.8
2,000-2,999		
Lenoir CC	2,161	17.1
Davidson Co. CC	2,165	12.1
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	13.9
Surry CC	2,342	16.2
Alamance CC	2,522	16.3
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	14.3
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	9.4
Wayne CC	2,680	15.3
Johnston CC	2,706	20.6
Sandhills CC	2,839	20.8
Catawba Valley CC	2,948	15.3
3,000-4,999		
Central Carolina CC	3,062	13.6
Cape Fear CC	3,080	16.9
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	11.2
Durham TCC	3,170	9.0
Pitt CC	3,260	16.7
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	18.8
Gaston CC	3,588	11.7
Forsyth TCC	4,099	9.8
>4,999		
Guilford TCC	5,366	11.8
Wake TCC	5,732	11.5
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	19.7
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	15.0
System	129,877	13.9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR IV: EDUCATION CONTINUUM

The state's public schools, community colleges and universities are increasingly interdependent. Each part of the continuum has a function which is both vital to the education of North Carolinians and to the efficient and effective functioning of the others. To the extent that the sectors of education work together, each will be improved, and the people will benefit. Effective community college partnerships with the public schools are necessary to accomplish two major objectives:

1. to provide a safety net for youth who drop out of school before they complete a high school education, and
2. to provide post high school education for students interested in technical or vocational studies or the first two years of a baccalaureate program.

Partnerships with the university system and other four-year institutions include working to provide a smooth transition for students who attend community colleges and wish to continue to study at the upper division, as well as to secure well-prepared instructional, administrative and other professional staff.

These linkages are critical for the well-being of students. Student progress is greatly enhanced if the adults who are responsible for preparing them and helping them make the transitions cooperate in their best interests. Community colleges have taken the lead in encouraging cooperative programs with high schools under the Huskins Bill and in "tech-prep" programs. Community colleges are also working to prepare students well for entry into university programs and to secure the cooperation of the university system in making that transition as smooth as possible.

The measures selected to indicate the success of the partnerships are:

A. Number and Percent of Recent High School Graduates Enrolled in Community College Programs

B. Number of and Enrollment in Cooperative Agreements with High Schools

C. Percent of Tech Prep Students Enrolling in a Community College

D. Number and Percent of Students in the UNC System Who Attended a Community College

EDUCATION CONTINUUM MEASURE A: ***Number and Percent of Recent High School Graduates Enrolled in Community College Programs***

Background

This measure is intended to show how successful community colleges are in attracting recent high school graduates into programs which will provide them with additional skills and enable them to be more productive citizens. In previous years it has not been possible to determine the year students enrolling in the community college graduated from high school. The Curriculum Registration file and the Extension Registration file were both modified in 1991-92 to include a data element for last year of high school attendance. In future years we should be able to reflect more accurately the number of recent high school graduates enrolled in community college programs.

The data we are using this year show the number of students aged 18-20 with 12 years of education (not dropouts) who enrolled in a community college. Clearly this could include graduates from several years and does not really even approximate the most recent year's graduates.

The data also show high school graduates in a given year and the number of seniors who said in a survey at the end of their senior year that they intended to go to a community college the following fall.

Implications

The data show that the percent of high school seniors expressing an intent to attend a community college declined slightly in 1993-94. The number of 18-20 year olds enrolled in 1993-94 also showed a small decline.

It is not clear as to why the number of 18-20 year olds enrolled in community colleges has declined over the past five years. It is interesting to note that during this same time period, the percent of high school seniors expressing an intent to enroll in a community college increased from 28.7 percent in 1989-90 to 31.4 percent in 1993-94.

The decline in enrollment in 1993-94 might be attributable to a stronger economy. Traditionally, when unemployment is low, enrollment in community colleges declines. With the relatively strong economy in 1993-94, it is possible that more 18-20 year olds were in the labor force and not seeking additional training.

90

Data

ENROLLMENT OF RECENT HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES AND HIGH SCHOOL SENIOR INTENT TO ENROLL IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

YEAR	COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENROLLMENT AGED 18-20	NUMBER OF H.S. GRADUATES	# AND % OF SENIORS WITH C.C. INTENT	
			#	%
1989-90	30,312	64,521	18,530	28.7
1990-91	29,745	62,533	19,352	30.9
1991-92	28,886	60,911	19,709	32.4
1992-93	28,829	60,210	19,112	31.7
1993-94	28,596	57,495	18,049	31.4

Source: ***Information Services, NC Community College System Office.***
NC Public Schools Statistical Profile, NC Dept. of Public Instruction.

Recommendation

The tracking of students from high school to postsecondary education or the workforce needs to be developed. A project involving the State Occupational Coordinating Committee (SOICC) is currently refining a Common Follow-Up System that will allow education agencies in North Carolina to match their data files with the Employment Security Commission Unemployment Insurance files as well as the data files from other educational and worker training programs in the state. This will allow a determination of the path taken by recent high school graduates in either education or employment.

EDUCATION CONTINUUM MEASURE B: ***Number of and Enrollment in Cooperative Agreements with High Schools***

Background

Agreements between high schools and community colleges enable students to get credit at the community college for work completed during high school instead of repeating it for a college grade. They also enable high school students to take advantage of courses which are not available at their high school. Effective articulation requires coordination of curricula, schedules and other joint initiatives by school and college personnel. These efforts often encounter barriers of historical conflicts, turf protection and simply inadequate time for the necessary work to be undertaken.

There are a number of ways schools and colleges can work together to achieve joint goals, but state level approval is required if the college sets up classes specifically for the high school students, or if there is credit given. These approved agreements are the subjects of the data.

Implications

Both the number of colleges and the number of agreements has increased over the past five years demonstrating the increased cooperation between the public schools and community colleges. Over half the community colleges currently have agreements with one or more public school in their area.

Currently efforts are underway to reexamine the Huskins Bill courses offered by colleges. These data should be observed carefully over the next several years for changes that occur as the result of modifications to the rules governing Huskins Bill courses.

Data

NUMBER OF COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH HIGH SCHOOLS

YEAR	NUMBER OF COLLEGES	NUMBER OF AGREEMENTS
1989-90	29	49
1990-91	33	64
1991-92	32	60
1992-93	32	46
1993-94	34	70

Source: ***Programs Division, NC Community College System Office.***

Tech Prep

The Tech Prep program is a relatively new cooperative venture between the community college system and the public schools. In this program, students complete a prescribed course of study during high school and then matriculate into the appropriate field at the community college. The number of Tech Prep programs has increased dramatically over the past three years. Data were available on student enrollment during 1993-94. The data demonstrate the degree to which Tech Prep programs are involving students.

NUMBER OF PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS RECEIVING TECH PREP GRANT MONEY

YEAR	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS	NUMBER OF ENROLLMENT
1989-90	4	*
1990-91	14	*
1991-92	67	*
1992-93	69	*
1993-94	114	60,238

*Data were not available.
60,238 is unduplicated headcount.

***Source:** LEA Tech Prep Grant Recipient Report, NC Dept. of Public Instruction.*

Recommendation

The joint use of facilities is a common practice that should be the subject of some study. The barriers to cooperation should be further examined. Data should be collected on the outcomes of Huskins Bill programs and Tech Prep.

EDUCATION CONTINUUM MEASURE C: ***Percent of Tech Prep Students Enrolling in a Community College***

Background

The Tech Prep programs were established as cooperative programs between North Carolina high schools and community colleges to provide a continuum of learning experiences for students involved in these programs. Through joint planning, the public schools and community colleges participating in the program have developed a sequence of courses beginning in high school and culminating at the community college that will prepare students academically for specific fields of study. The programs include both academic as well as technical courses.

The concept behind Tech Prep is to provide the traditionally non-college (four-year college) bound student with an alternative that will prepare them for a career path. Students completing the Tech Prep program and entering the community college should be better prepared than students who simply pass through a general education sequence in the public schools. The Tech Prep students should require less remediation and should be able to progress through a community college program at a quicker pace.

Since the Tech Prep program was initiated in 1989-90, not enough students have passed from the high schools to the community colleges to make this measure meaningful. However, as the number of students completing the high school component increases, it becomes important for data to be collected on the number that matriculate to a community college. Currently a Tech Prep task force is developing accountability measures for this program. These measures will be incorporated into future critical success factors reports.

Recommendation

Once the Tech Prep task force has completed the development and implementation of accountability standards, this information should be reported in the critical success factors report for the system and for individual colleges.

Background

The transfer program has been an important part of the community college mission from its beginning, even though the numbers of students involved are relatively small. This measure indicates how many students are transferring and what percentage of the UNC system's students were once community college students.

For some UNC system institutions, transfers are a significant percentage of enrollments (as at UNC-Charlotte). For others, they are a negligible number. While there are many factors involved, it is important that the university and community colleges work together to make transfer possible by insuring that curricula are complementary, that students know what they will need to transfer and that students are assisted by the receiving institution in complying with its rules.

The data understate the transfer picture since they do not include students who may have transferred to a university during the spring semester; the data only show those transfers that occurred in the summer or fall semester. It is not now possible to show how the transfer rates of community college graduates compare with non-graduates.

Community colleges can serve as a way to increase the numbers of citizens who eventually attain a baccalaureate or graduate degree by providing a transition point that may be more comfortable, affordable or better suited to the needs of many students. In this way, they also can provide educational opportunities for groups such as minorities who have been underserved in the past.

Implications

Community colleges are an untapped resource for North Carolina universities. They also represent a viable way that students are getting the first two years of baccalaureate education in a setting that is more affordable to themselves and to the state. The numbers of transfers are rising, in line with the resolution of the Joint Boards of Education adopted in March 1989 which set a goal of a seven percent per year increase.

The number of transfers from community colleges to UNC institutions showed a 6.3 percent increase in 1993-94. This increase undoubtedly reflects the growing role of transfer education in community colleges. Indeed, if North Carolina is to have a "seamless education system" then the increased cooperation between the three public education systems is necessary to ensure a smooth transition for students from one system to the next.

Data

TRANSFERS FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGES TO THE UNC SYSTEM

YEAR	NUMBER	PERCENT CHANGE	PERCENT OF ALL TRANSFERS
1989	2,868	12.3	35.7
1990	3,207	11.8	35.9
1991	4,035	26.6	40.5
1992	4,021	-0.3	40.2
1993	4,274	6.3	41.3

Source: ***Statistical Abstract of Higher Education in North Carolina, UNC General Administration.***

Recommendation

These data need to be improved. Data on community college graduates and non-graduates should be developed. There is a comprehensive study of college transfer by the UNC system and the North Carolina Community College System now underway that should should improve the data currently being reported.

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR V: WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Supporting North Carolina's economic development has been an important part of the mission of the community college system since its beginning. The system is a major tool for providing the state's citizens with the education and skills they need to be productive in the workforce. The system's institutions have traditionally worked closely with the businesses in their areas to insure that the programs offered by the college prepare citizens to take the jobs that are available. They have also provided citizens with the skills to be self-employed.

North Carolina originated customized training programs for new industries which agreed to come into the state, and its approach has been copied widely. This program remains a strong part of the state's economic development arsenal, along with other categorically funded programs for existing industries and small business.

In addition to these specialized programs, the system's ability to stay current with the job market protects the state from skill shortages and protects its citizens from finding their skills outdated by changing technology and market forces. Measures of the success of the system in staying on the cutting edge are difficult to determine but important.

Renewed emphasis has been placed on the role of North Carolina community colleges in workforce development by the State Board of Community Colleges. A new mission statement for the system and a new set of system goals have been adopted by the State Board of Community Colleges which emphasize training and retraining for a "world-class workforce."

The measures which have been identified for the success of the system in its economic development role are:

A. Number of Employers and Trainees Served by: New and Expanding Industry, Focused Industrial Training, Small Business Centers, Apprenticeship Programs

B. Number of Workplace Literacy Sites and Number of Students Being Served

C. Employer Satisfaction With Graduates

D. Employment Status of Graduates

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT MEASURE A: *Number of Employers and Trainees Served by: New and Expanding Industry, Focused Industrial Training, Small Business Centers, Apprenticeship Programs*

Background

The programs which are examined by this measure are the categorical programs created specifically to address employer needs. They are very popular, partly due to the responsive and flexible way in which they allow the colleges to respond when specialized needs are identified.

North Carolina's New and Expanding Industry training program provides the customized training which has been a major part of the state's economic development strategy, and the Focused Industrial Training Program (FIT) has added similar services for existing businesses.

Small Business Centers were created to train entrepreneurs and existing small business owners. It is increasingly important to support home-grown enterprise, since the feasibility of attracting businesses from out of state has declined. It is also a fact that more jobs are created by small businesses than by large ones. These very popular programs provide only a limited amount of one-on-one assistance, but instead offer workshops and seminars for their clients and provide resource and referral services.

North Carolina has not had a history of strong apprenticeship programs. The community colleges have mainly supported apprenticeship by providing related instruction in areas where enough apprentices are enrolled to form a class.

Implications

New and Expanding Industry continues to serve an increasing number of trainees and a significant number of employers in any given year. FIT is a newer program. The years which show marked increases in FIT enrollees are years in which new FIT centers were funded. Both programs continue to reach substantial numbers of employers and employees with training services. The Small Business Center program also continues to reach a large number of people with the range of services indicated.

The increase in the number of business clients served by the small business centers can be attributed partially to the opening of three additional centers in 1991-92. The number of clients served by the small business centers declined in 1993-94. The reason for the decline is not evident but could be a reflection of the business cycle during 1993-94 or the types of clients being served by the small business centers being the ones who are more serious about operating a small business and fewer individuals simply gathering information.

NEW & EXPANDING INDUSTRY TRAINEES & PROJECTS

YEAR	TRAINEES	PROJECTS
1989-90	16,807	165
1990-91	14,857	140
1991-92	15,738	151
1992-93	16,640	160
1993-94	19,537	180

Source: ***Annual Report of Training Projects for New & Expanding Industries, Business and Industry Services, NC Community College System Office.***

FOCUSED INDUSTRIAL TRAINING: TRAINEES & INDUSTRIES SERVED*

YEAR	TRAINEES	INDUSTRIES
1989-90	8,861	954
1990-91	8,906	794
1991-92	11,461	1.062
1992-93	14,129	977
1993-94	10,525	985

* Includes the apprenticeship program.

Source: ***Business and Industry Services, NC Community College System Office.***

SMALL BUSINESS CLIENTS SERVED

YEAR	# OF CENTERS	PARTICIPANTS	COUNSEL	REFERRAL	EXT./CURR. COURSE PARTICIPANT
1989-90	50	43,736	7,098	5,998	12,950
1990-91	50	43,563	9,456	6,143	10,847
1991-92	53	45,981	15,472	14,101	9,719
1992-93	53	46,511	12,922	7,447	10,307
1993-94	53	38,582	10,671	3,479	11,355

Source: ***Small Business Progress Report, Business and Industry Services, NC Community College System Office.***

Recommendation

These data do not indicate the quality or cost effectiveness of the training being provided by the programs involved. Ways to show those elements should be developed and/or provided through regular evaluation of the programs. Emphasis should be given to the development of outcomes measures for the programs. An ongoing assessment of these programs, as well as all other programs offered by the community colleges, should be implemented.

Currently efforts are underway to develop outcome measures for FIT, New and Expanding Industry, and the Small Business Centers. Notably, a measure of small businesses that receive services and remain in business for two years is being developed. These data will be reported as they become available.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT MEASURE B: ***Number of Workplace Literacy Sites and Number of Students Being Served***

Background

According to a June 26, 1990 report prepared for The Governor's Commission on Workforce Preparedness, the proportion of workforce participants in North Carolina with at least a high school diploma is only 60 percent. The large number of adults currently in the workforce without a high school diploma represents a major obstacle for the future economic development of the state. Whereas the old technology of industry could absorb those individuals lacking a high school diploma, the technology of today's industries cannot. It is estimated that in 1990, 35 percent of all jobs in the nation were unskilled. By the year 2000 only 15 percent of the jobs will be unskilled. Clearly there is a great need to upgrade the skills of today's unskilled workers.

Workers of today must possess basic skills that are far different from those basic skills of yesterday. In addition to communication skills and basic mathematical skills, today's worker must be able to think critically, work effectively in teams, and apply problem-solving skills. The key to the future economic well being of the state is an appropriately educated workforce.

A major barrier that exists for many workers in need of literacy and basic skills training is the availability and accessibility of the training. These individuals are often under financial and other pressures that prevent them from pursuing literacy classes at the community college. In order to meet the needs of these workers, workplace literacy sites are being established across the state. A cooperative venture between the community colleges and the local industries, this program establishes basic skills classes at the industry site and tailors program content to complement workplace needs. The idea behind the program is that if classes are more accessible, more workers will participate, and if the content is more relevant to workplace needs, more workers will complete the program.

Implications

Data on the number of workplace literacy sites and on the number of students being served by these programs indicates the program's success. There was a small decline in the number of workplace literacy sites and the number of students enrolled in 1993-94, but this may be due to random fluctuations in the availability of sites. The data will be carefully tracked over the next several years to ensure that no trend in downward enrollment is occurring.

With the implementation of the Literacy Education Information System, data should be available in the future to determine the success of students participating in the workplace literacy site programs as compared with students in traditional basic skills programs.

Data

NUMBER OF WORKPLACE LITERACY SITES AND NUMBER OF STUDENTS BEING SERVED

YEAR	NUMBER OF SITES	STUDENTS ENROLLED
1989-90	325	7,611
1990-91	391	7,506
1991-92	430	10,404
1992-93	417	10,547
1993-94	400	10,222

Source: ***Workplace Basic Skills Sites in NC, 1993-94,***
Federal Annual Literacy Report,
Basic Skills, NC Community College System Office.

Recommendation

Data should continue to be collected on this measure. An analysis of the success of students participating in the workplace literacy program should be conducted. This analysis should not only determine the success of the students in the program, but should also examine factors related to the structure of the program at different industries and the effect those factors have on the success of the students. Further, some cost analysis on the workplace literacy program compared to other literacy programs may provide useful information.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT MEASURE C: *Employer Satisfaction With Graduates*

Background

Employer satisfaction with community college students is a critical test of all programs. A 1991 survey of North Carolina employers conducted for the Governor's Commission on Workforce Preparedness revealed that 72.4 percent of employers are satisfied, overall, with the preparation community college students are getting. This compared with only 29 percent expressing satisfaction with public schools. While such data are encouraging, nevertheless they do not reflect the performance of specific graduates nor do they provide insight on the nature of weaknesses which are encountered.

Individual institutions in the system conduct employer surveys as part of their planning process and/or program review process, but there is no systematic coordination of the effort. Such data were collected at one time through a state sponsored survey of employers, but they are no longer collected. The survey results were generally very favorable.

The North Carolina Community College System Office is now working with the North Carolina State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee on the development of an interagency follow-up system that would track the education and training histories, placement, employment and wages of former participants in the state's education and training programs. The system, similar to one that has been established in Florida and several other states, utilizes information from the Unemployment Insurance database maintained by the Employment Security Commission. Under this system, student records from the community colleges are matched with the Unemployment Insurance records revealing which students are employed, the name and address of their employer, and their quarterly wages. The data base does not include the position or job type of former students.

A second step would be to use the information on employers generated by the Unemployment Insurance database to survey employers. The survey would be designed to gather information on the position or job type of former students and on employer satisfaction.

The first phase of this project has been completed. Student records have successfully been matched with information in the Unemployment Insurance files. Efforts will continue to focus on the further development of this tracking system and the assessment of employer satisfaction.

Recommendation

Employer evaluation of programs is an essential accountability tool. The community college system should continue to work with the NC SOICC to develop and implement the interagency follow-up system. Funds and other resources should be sought to develop and implement a state-wide employer survey.

Beginning in 1994-95, all colleges are required to review all programs annually using a State Board of Community Colleges adopted Annual Program Audit. One measure contained in the Audit is employer satisfaction. Until such time as a common follow-up system is developed to report employer satisfaction, data extracted from the colleges' Annual Program Audit will be aggregated at the college level, allowing for the reporting of an overall employer satisfaction measure for the college and the system.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT MEASURE D: *Employment Status of Graduates*

Background

The most important measure of the effectiveness of programs intended to help people get and secure good jobs is the record of students accomplishing that goal. There is much anecdotal data about the success of community college students. Often instructors who are close to their students and program heads who are close to the employers know whether their students are getting jobs. This anecdotal evidence is very strong for some programs, such as nursing, but absent or less promising for others. It is more difficult for an instructor with large classes or for program administrators when the programs have more dispersed labor markets to be as exact about the numbers of students who are placed, though they often have a good "feel" for the situation.

Nevertheless, comprehensive student follow-up is really the only way to have complete data on placement rates, and student follow-up is expensive. While a partial student follow-up was conducted each year for several years, the data included only twelve colleges each year. Thus, the data are not comparable over the state. Problems with response rates and the sample nature of the follow-up also precluded definitive results. The partial student follow-up was funded by the federal government as part of an assessment of vocational education programs. Those funds are no longer available and, as a result, the partial student follow-up will not be continued.

Many colleges are conducting student follow-up surveys, often in conjunction with program review. These surveys include questions related to employment status and provide valuable information to the college. The follow-up is not occurring at all colleges, however, and thus the data are not collected at the system level.

As discussed in Workforce Development Measure C, the North Carolina Community College System Office is working with the NC SOICC on the development of an interagency student follow-up system that will utilize the unemployment insurance database maintained by the Employment Security Commission. Data regarding employment status are now available for 1990-91, 1991-92 and 1992-93 graduates.

Currently efforts are underway to analyze the data on 1991-92 and 1992-93 graduates. Due to some problems encountered with the data files and a staffing shortage, the analysis of the data were unavailable at the time this document was printed. A supplemental mailing with the results of the analysis will take place in late Spring, 1995.

The data reported below are data on the 1990-91 graduates, one year after graduation. The data represent employment rates and salary. These tables will be updated when more current information is available.

Implications

The data indicate that one year after graduation, 97 percent of the 1990-91 completers for which data are available were employed. Though conclusions cannot be drawn on one year's data, the implication is that community college completers are successful in obtaining employment.

Data

PERCENT OF 1990-91 COMPLETERS EMPLOYED BY PROGRAM TYPE ONE YEAR AFTER GRADUATION

YEAR	COLLEGE TRANSFER STUDENTS	GENERAL EDUCATION STUDENTS	TECHNICAL STUDENTS	VOCATIONAL STUDENTS	ALL STUDENTS
1992-93	95%	96%	97%	96%	97%

FIRST YEAR MEDIAN EARNINGS FOR 1990-91 COMMUNITY COLLEGE COMPLETERS

YEAR	DEGREE TYPE		
	CERTIFICATE	DIPLOMA	AAS DEGREE
1991-92	$20, 689	$20,025	$23,102

Recommendation

Placement rates are one of the essential indicators for programs focused on the workforce, but a more appropriate measure would focus on employment rate in a related field. The Community College System Office should continue to work with the NC SOICC on the interagency follow-up system to expand the data collection efforts to include the determination of whether or not the employment is in a related field.

Part of the mission of the comprehensive community college is to provide special services for the citizens of the community. These services take the form of providing educational opportunities which help individuals to be better citizens, parents and just better people. We have tended to let community services become defined as the classes offered, particularly in avocational or leisure-time activities. However, the real meaning of community services encompasses the role of the college in supporting leadership development in the community, offering its facilities as a meeting place, providing cultural activities and other specialized functions. It includes the activities of college personnel in supporting the civic and benevolent activities of the community. The wide range of the types of things that community services includes is evidence of the key role community colleges play in the life of individual, and very different, communities.

Community services classes have been funded through a block grant since 1987-88. Funding for community services classes shows the effect of financial pressure, so enrollments have minimum value as a performance indicator. However, the data we have available measures the number of avocational, practical skills and other courses that are offered and their enrollment. Data have also been collected on the use of campus facilities by outside groups, and data on community financial support of the colleges have been compiled.

For fiscal year 1991-92, the funds for community service and the visiting artist program were cut in half and combined into one block grant. The legislature and the State Board of Community Colleges maintained their position that all colleges must have a presence in community service and the cultural arts. For fiscal year 1992-93, the block grant to support community service was reduced by another 14.4 percent and the North Carolina Arts Council made the decision to discontinue the visiting artist program with community colleges.

The measures of community service are:

A. Number of Courses Offered and Students Enrolled Through Community Services (Avocational, Practical Skills, Academic, Cultural/Civic)

B. Enrollment of Senior Citizens

C. Support of Community Service Activities (Use of Facilities by Outside Groups; Support of Civic and Cultural Activities)

COMMUNITY SERVICES MEASURE A: *Number of Courses Offered and Students Enrolled Through Community Services (Avocational, Practical Skills, Academic and Recreational)*

Background

The community college mission in continuing education is well established. In the North Carolina system, a distinction has been made between continuing education courses designed to enhance occupational skills and those courses which offer non-credit academic, avocational, practical skills or recreational learning activities. All courses in these categories, except for recreational classes, must be approved by the State Board before a college can offer them, since they are eligible for state funding. Occupational classes are funded by an FTE formula similar to credit (or curriculum) courses, though at a lower level. The other categories are supported by a block grant for community services, an approach which was begun in 1987-88. Recreational classes must be self-supporting. Other classes MAY be offered on a self-supporting basis, but if so, they do not earn FTE toward the college's share of the block grant. Fees collected for such classes may be used to enable the college to continue and expand its community services program. This provision enables the community services program to grow even though state funding is kept to a minimum level.

Implications

The data show that total enrollment in community services courses declined by approximately 16 percent in 1991-92, 9.4 percent in 1992-93, and 18.3 percent in 1993-94. This is undoubtedly the result of the community services block grant being reduced. It should be noted that enrollment in all categories of community services courses declined in 1993-94, with the greatest declines occurring in the academic and avocational courses.

Data

ENROLLMENT IN COMMUNITY SERVICES COURSES
(Duplicated Across Type)

YEAR	ACADEMIC	AVOCATIONAL	PRAC. SKILLS	RECREATIONAL	TOTAL COM. SER. ENROLL	% OF SYS. ENROLL
1989-90	28,152	53,135	34,858	2,087	110,451*	14.9
1990-91	30,275	52,897	41,059	2,831	119,708*	15.9
1991-92	28,348	45,040	29,162	3,891	100,798*	13.4
1992-93	24,030	41,999	27,971	5,996	95,190*	12.5
1993-94	21,027	34,660	25,385	4,102	77,817*	10.5

*Unduplicated total enrollment.

Source: ***Annual Statistical Report, Information Services, NC Community College System Office.***

Recommendation

This is a useful measure, especially as compared to system enrollments. These data should be carefully monitored to determine the impact of funding changes in community services. As was stated in the introduction of the community services factor, the block grants for community services and visiting artists were cut in half and combined into a single block grant beginning with fiscal year 1991-92. In the future these data will be one of the indicators of the impact of this funding change.

COMMUNITY SERVICES MEASURE B: ***Enrollment of Senior Citizens***

Background

One of the purposes of community services activities is to reach citizens who have few alternatives. Senior citizens are the major group, but citizens in rest and nursing homes, prisons, mental health and alcohol rehabilitation facilities, etc. are also among those served with these classes and other activities.

Senior citizens make up a majority of those enrolled in community services classes. These citizens depend on community college activities for opportunities to fulfill learning objectives which may have been postponed, to help them cope with health, financial or other problems, and to improve their general quality of life. The state has a historic commitment to them and provides community college classes tuition-free. Community colleges contribute to making North Carolina attractive to retirees.

Data have not previously been collected on the characteristics of participants in community service activities. While such data can be readily collected from participants in classes, it is difficult and expensive to collect data from participants in other types of community service activities. It is possible, however, to determine the number of senior citizens enrolled in community services classes since age is collected at the time of registration.

Implications

The data demonstrate that community colleges play a vital role in enabling senior citizens to pursue learning. In 1993-94 a total of 24,966 senior citizens enrolled in community services programs at the community colleges. By reaching out to this segment of the population, community colleges are providing a valuable community service in enriching all citizens of North Carolina. By providing free tuition to senior citizens, colleges enable many North Carolinians to spend their senior years in meaningful, learning activities.

It is evident from the data that the number of senior citizens participating in community services program has declined over the past three years. The exact reason for this decline is not currently known, but a likely explanation is that with the reduction in the community service block grant, the number of programs that may have been offered to senior citizens has been reduced.

Data

**ENROLLMENT OF SENIOR CITIZENS (65 OR OLDER)
IN COMMUNITY SERVICES PROGRAMS**

YEAR	COMMUNITY SERVICE
1989-90	44,262
1990-91	44,536
1991-92	36,662
1992-93	31,473
1993-94	24,966

Source: ***Annual Statistical Report, Information Services, NC Community College System Office.***

Recommendation

Data on the number of senior citizens enrolled is an important measure in understanding the breadth of the community college mission. These data should continue to be monitored. At the same time an estimate of lost revenue resulting from enrolling senior citizens tuition free should be developed. This measure could have implications for projecting tuition receipts in the future.

COMMUNITY SERVICES MEASURE C:

Support of Community Services (Use of Facilities by Outside Groups; Support of Civic and Cultural Activities)

Background

The role that community colleges play goes beyond the educational mission that is normally associated with colleges. In many communities the colleges provide a focal point for community activity and cultural events. Whether it is providing a central location for community groups to meet, holding forums during political debates, or sponsoring events in the fine arts, the colleges have a major impact on the quality of life in the community.

It is not easy to measure the true impact of the colleges on the quality of life in their service area with data that are currently being collected. It is possible, however, to demonstrate the extent to which the colleges provide services to the community. Two measures have been chosen to indicate the extent to which the community colleges support community services activities.

The first measure examines the role that the community colleges play as a center of local activity. The mission of the community college system relative to community service includes providing, where needed, a central location for meetings and events of local community groups. For many communities, the college provides the facilities that make many of their functions possible.

Each college was asked to record the number of outside groups using the facilities and the number of hours the facilities were used by these groups. An outside group was defined as any group not directly associated with the college. Thus, if the local chamber of commerce or the county commissioners held a meeting at the college, such an event would be recorded.

The second measure of the colleges' support of community services activities is the number of civic and cultural events the colleges sponsor or co-sponsor. These non-FTE generating activities are designed to fulfill the community service mission of the colleges. For many communities, the colleges are the center of civic and cultural events, providing enriching experiences for all members of the community.

It is difficult to measure the impact that the civic and cultural events sponsored by the college have on the community. Colleges have been asked to maintain a total count on the number of non-FTE generating civic and cultural events that were either sponsored or co-sponsored by the college. The data are presented on the next page.

Implications

The data on the number of outside groups using the college facilities and the total hours of usage indicate that the colleges do provide a valuable service to the community in making the college facilities available to outside groups. The data show that the number of outside groups using the college facilities in 1993-94 increased significantly. While data on availability of space to respond to requests was not systematically collected, many colleges reported not being able to meet all the requests for use of the facilities due to the scheduling of classes during the day and evening.

Data

NUMBER OF OUTSIDE GROUPS USING COLLEGE FACILITIES AND TOTAL HOURS OF FACILITIES USAGE BY OUTSIDE GROUPS

YEAR	NUMBER OF GROUPS		HOURS OF FACILITIES USAGE	
	TOTAL	MEAN	TOTAL	MEAN
1990-91	5,466	94	60,282	1,039
1991-92	4,240	75	65,838	1,176
1992-93	4,238	77	81,403	1,480
1993-94	5,202	102	78,111	1,532

Source: ***Planning and Research, NC Community College System Office.***

The data on the colleges' support of civic and cultural events demonstrate that they are fulfilling their community service mission. In examining the data, it must be remembered that these civic and cultural events are in addition to FTE generating civic and cultural events.

Data

NUMBER OF NON-FTE GENERATING CIVIC AND CULTURAL EVENTS SPONSORED OR CO-SPONSORED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGES

YEAR	NUMBER OF SPONSORED EVENTS		NUMBER OF CO-SPONSORED EVENTS	
	TOTAL	MEAN	TOTAL	MEAN
1990-91	1,157	20	1,075	19
1991-92	1,303	23	935	17
1992-93	1,699	31	1,168	21
1993-94	1,347	26	2,122	42

Source: ***Planning and Research, NC Community College System Office.***

Recommendation

This measure needs to be examined more closely. While it is clear that college facilities are being used extensively by outside groups, it is not known what types of groups are using the facilities or how the facilities are being used. This may be the topic of a special study to determine the impacts beyond educational program offerings that community colleges have on the counties in which they are located. In addition, a study should be designed to determine the impact that the sponsoring of civic and cultural events have on the community.

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR VII: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT/ACCOUNTABILITY

Educational institutions across the nation are being held accountable for their actions as never before. Federal legislation in the form of the Campus Security and Right to Know Act and Carl Perkins Act regulations have caused colleges to look more closely not just at the process of what they are doing, but also at the end product—the outcomes of their actions. The General Assembly, in examining budget requests, is keenly interested in the return on the state's investment in the community colleges. Accrediting agencies, the chief of which is the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), have made demonstrated institutional effectiveness a major factor in the accreditation or reaffirmation of a college. The North Carolina State Board of Community Colleges has adopted, as one of four system goals, the goal of Accountability and Standards.

To be accountable is to be answerable for, implying that the accountable party is responsible for a satisfactory explanation. That in turn implies that the accountable party has sufficient authority and resources to produce a satisfactory account.

Accountability for the community college system is shared by the State Board, the local boards, state and local administrative staffs and faculty. Each has responsibilities for which it is held accountable. A well-organized and managed system will provide appropriate authority and resources at each level and hold each group appropriately accountable.

The entire process of planning, program review, evaluation of results and these critical success factors themselves makes up an essential part of the comprehensive accountability system. Traditionally, accountability has been defined primarily in terms of accountability for funds, but these measures also indicate how programs are managed.

The measures chosen are:

A. Annual Educational Program Audit Summary—Number Audited and Percent of System Instructional Budget Cited for Exceptions

B. Number and Percent of Programs Reviewed

C. Number and Percent of Eligible Programs Accredited or Reaffirmed

ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURE A: ***Annual Educational Program Audit Summary—Number Audited and Percent of System Instructional Budget Cited for Exceptions***

Background

Auditors from the Community College System Office review the records of each college and determine the integrity of the accounts. Since the funds are distributed by a formula which is primarily driven by the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students in class, and the types of classes "earn" different amounts of dollars, it is important that students be properly counted and that classes be properly designated by type. Tuition must be properly charged and collected, and classes must meet in proper settings for approved periods of time. These and certain other details are the subject of the program audits.

The data show the number of audits conducted, the percentage of audits with exceptions, the resulting financial adjustments made as a result of the audits, and the percent of system instructional budget accounted for by the financial adjustments.

The available data are for audits conducted in 1989-90 through 1993-94 covering program years 1987-88 through 1992-93. The number of program auditors employed by the system has increased over the years. This has resulted in increased ability to conduct more audits, to conduct more extensive audits, and to provide advice that prevents audit concerns. As recommended, the system also changed its procedures to provide for more balance between the amount of auditors' time focused on continuing education and curriculum programs. These changes are reflected in shifts in the numbers and types of questions raised by the auditors.

Implications

In 1993-94 fewer colleges were cited for audit exceptions. The percent of audits with exceptions and the resulting financial adjustments declined significantly. This decline in audit exceptions and resulting financial adjustments is an indicator of the careful management of programs taking place at the colleges.

Data

EDUCATION PROGRAM AUDIT SUMMARY: NUMBER OF COLLEGES AUDITED, NUMBER OF EXCEPTIONS CITED, PERCENTAGE OF AUDITS WITH EXCEPTIONS

YEAR	COLLEGES AUDITED	COLLEGES CITED FOR EXCEPTIONS	% OF AUDITS WITH EXCEPTIONS	RESULTING FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENT	% OF SYSTEM INSTRUC. EXPEND.
1989-90	52	38	73	$ 159,197	0.07
1990-91	58	32	52	$ 285,348	0.12
1991-92	58	23	39	$ 175,802	0.07
1992-93	58	28	47	$1,174,682	0.45
1993-94	58	26	43	$ 500,395	0.17

Source: ***Annual Audit Summary, Auditing and Accounting, NC Community College System Office.***

Recommendation

The data on the number of audits and exceptions is useful, but a better way to indicate the seriousness of the exceptions and their satisfactory resolution needs to be developed. A way to show whether the colleges corrected problems or continued to have the same ones should be developed.

EDUCATION PROGRAM AUDIT SUMMARY, 1993-94: COLLEGES CITED FOR EXCEPTIONS AND RESULTING FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS

INSTITUTION	FTE	RESULTING FINAN. ADJUSTMENT	% OF INSTRUC. BUDET
<1,000			
Pamlico CC	182		
Montgomery CC	662		
Tri-County CC	669		
Bladen CC	672		
McDowell TCC	772		
Martin CC	928		
Brunswick CC	949		
Anson CC	951		
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960		
1,000-1,999			
Mayland CC	1,033	$1,075	0.05
James Sprunt CC	1,124	$11,529	0.44
Sampson CC	1,268		
Piedmont CC	1,278	$10,303	0.39
Carteret CC	1,289	$2,454	0.07
Haywood CC	1,359	$11,696	0.38
Nash CC	1,390	$8,623	0.26
Wilson TCC	1,405		
Mitchell CC	1,406	$13,111	0.43
Cleveland CC	1,464		
Halifax CC	1,473	$14,349	0.43
Isothermal CC	1,495		
Southwestern CC	1,495		
Blue Ridge CC	1,500		
College of The Albemarle	1,504	$5,445	0.15
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515		
Stanly CC	1,517		
Richmond CC	1,522		
Randolph CC	1,624		
Edgecombe CC	1,647	$35,329	0.87
Rockingham CC	1,670		
Southeastern CC	1,717		
Wilkes CC	1,740		
Robeson CC	1,794	$4,313	0.11
Craven CC	1,980	$16,043	0.34
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	$4,382	0.09
2,000-2,999			
Lenoir CC	2,161	$33,527	0.66
Davidson Co. CC	2,165		
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	$1,594	0.03
Surry CC	2,342		
Alamance CC	2,522	$4,202	0.07
Vance-Granville CC	2,540		
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633		
Wayne CC	2,680	$8,562	0.14
Johnston CC	2,706	$35,684	0.56
Sandhills CC	2,839		
Catawba Valley CC	2,948		
3,000-4,999			
Central Carolina CC	3,062		
Cape Fear CC	3,080	$18,736	0.28
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	$14,922	0.21
Durham TCC	3,170		
Pitt CC	3,260	$39,526	0.53
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346		
Gaston CC	3,588	$25,212	0.32
Forsyth TCC	4,099		
>4,999			
Guilford TCC	5,366	$37,795	0.30
Wake TCC	5,732	$51,282	0.43
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	$7,475	0.04
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	$80,426	0.35
System	129,877	$497,595	0.30

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURE B: Number and Percent of Programs Reviewed

---

Background

The State Board adopted a policy in October 1989 requiring that each college review all its curriculum programs every five years. Models for comprehensive program reviews were developed by a consortium of five colleges and disseminated throughout the system. The colleges submit summaries of their reviews to the Program Services section of the Community College System Office.

As the first five years of the policy go by, a larger number of reviews can be expected each year. Colleges are gaining knowledge about the review process and skills in conducting the investigations required. At the campus level, reviews are becoming increasingly valuable as sources of information about program strengths and weaknesses.

A recent report by the Government Performance Audit Committee (GPAC) has focused additional attention on program review. Contained in the report are recommendations that the system strengthen guidelines for program review and include guidelines for program termination. A task force on program review was established and, working with an accountability task force, has developed new guidelines for program review. These new guidelines will require, among other things, the annual review of all programs using a "desktop audit" model that is being developed.

The data being reported represent the percent of programs approved to be offered by a college prior to February 1, 1990 that had not been officially terminated by February 1, 1995. These programs should have been reviewed in the five year cycle. Programs approved for a college to offer after February 1, 1990 are not included in the report. The data indicate the percent of programs that have been reviewed as of April 24, 1995.

Implications

The data show that 84 percent of the system's approved programs have been reviewed and a report submitted to the Community College System Office as of April 24, 1995. The timeframe for colleges to review the remaining 17 percent of programs has been extended until July. In addition, colleges have been encouraged to utilize the newly adopted Annual Program Audit to review those programs that were not reviewed in the five year program cycle.

Data

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS APPROVED BEFORE JANUARY, 1990 AND PERCENT OF THOSE PROGRAMS REVIEWED
(As of May 1, 1995)

NUMBER OF APPROVED PROGRAMS	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS OFFERED	% OF APPROVED PROGRAMS REVIEWED
1,709	1,431	84

Source: ***Curriculum Program Review Summary, Programs Division, NC Community College System Office.***

Recommendation

The State Board of Community Colleges had adopted the Annual Program Audit which will be used by colleges to review all programs and services annually. As a result, this measure, percent of programs reviewed, is no longer relevant. A new measure or measures should be developed based on the outcomes of the Annual Program Audit. One such measure might be the number or percent of programs that do not meet the standards set by the Annual Program Audit.

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS APPROVED BEFORE JANUARY, 1990 AND PERCENT OF THOSE PROGRAMS REVIEWED (As of 5/1/95)

INSTITUTION	FTE	# APPROVED	# REVIEW	% REVIEW
<1,000				
Pamlico CC	182	4	3	75
Montgomery CC	662	19	19	100
Tri-County CC	669	10	4	40
Bladen CC	672	18	13	72
McDowell TCC	772	25	25	100
Martin CC	928	19	7	37
Brunswick CC	949	14	9	64
Anson CC	951	31	3	10
Roanoke-Chowan CC	960	17	1	6
1,000-1,999				
Mayland CC	1,033	27	9	33
James Sprunt CC	1,124	26	23	88
Sampson CC	1,268	16	15	94
Piedmont CC	1,278	26	19	73
Carteret CC	1,289	22	21	95
Haywood CC	1,359	29	27	93
Nash CC	1,390	26	25	96
Wilson TCC	1,405	26	26	100
Mitchell CC	1,406	17	17	100
Cleveland CC	1,464	31	25	81
Halifax CC	1,473	25	25	100
Isothermal CC	1,495	24	23	96
Southwestern CC	1,495	30	23	77
Blue Ridge CC	1,500	21	16	76
College of The Albemarle	1,504	23	22	96
Beaufort Co. CC	1,515	20	20	100
Stanly CC	1,517	27	27	100
Richmond CC	1,522	17	17	100
Randolph CC	1,624	22	21	95
Edgecombe CC	1,647	33	23	70
Rockingham CC	1,670	20	8	40
Southeastern CC	1,717	26	26	100
Wilkes CC	1,740	36	36	100
Robeson CC	1,794	22	19	86
Craven CC	1,980	39	39	100
Western Piedmont CC	1,982	37	37	100
2,000-2,999				
Lenoir CC	2,161	42	42	100
Davidson Co. CC	2,165	24	24	100
Caldwell CC & TI	2,314	26	24	92
Surry CC	2,342	29	26	90
Alamance CC	2,522	33	32	97
Vance-Granville CC	2,540	41	38	93
Rowan-Cabarrus CC	2,633	27	25	93
Wayne CC	2,680	47	47	100
Johnston CC	2,706	47	2	4
Sandhills CC	2,839	28	28	100
Catawba Valley CC	2,948	39	38	97
3,000-4,999				
Central Carolina CC	3,062	41	28	68
Cape Fear CC	3,080	22	18	82
Asheville-Buncombe TCC	3,161	33	33	100
Durham TCC	3,170	33	33	100
Pitt CC	3,260	37	36	97
Coastal Carolina CC	3,346	44	42	95
Gaston CC	3,588	33	9	27
Forsyth TCC	4,099	33	23	70
>4,999				
Guilford TCC	5,366	49	49	100
Wake TCC	5,732	49	39	80
Fayetteville TCC	8,254	62	62	100
Central Piedmont CC	9,973	65	60	92
System	129,877	1,709	1,431	84

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURE C: ***Number and Percent of Eligible Programs Accredited or Reaffirmed***

Background

In addition to approval by the State Board of Community Colleges, many curriculum programs are eligible for accreditation by outside agencies. For some programs, such as the Associate Degree Nursing program, accreditation by an outside agency is required by the Community College System Office in order for the program to be offered. A number of programs, however, do not have mandatory accreditation requirements. Colleges can choose whether or not to accredit these programs.

There are a number of reasons why a college would want to accredit a program that does not carry mandatory accreditation by the Community College System. In several cases, for a graduate to be a candidate for licensure or certification, the program must be accredited by the agency issuing the license or certificate. In other cases, accreditation may raise the status of the program since it documents adherence to a given set of state or national standards. Finally, accreditation can be thought of as a program management tool, like program review, for it provides standards by which to judge the curriculum.

There are also reasons not to seek accreditation. The accreditation process can be costly, with some accreditations costing several thousand dollars. In addition, the college may not have the faculty or staff resources necessary to carry out the accreditation process; there is a time cost involved. Finally, the requirements for accreditation may be beyond the resources of the college. For example, there may be equipment or library requirements that the college simply cannot meet.

Implications

A survey conducted by the Programs Division of the Community College System Office identified 47 technical and vocational programs being offered throughout the system which were eligible for voluntary accreditation. During 1992-93 these 47 programs totaled 457 offerings throughout the system, 31 percent of which were accredited. This number does not include those programs which have an accreditation requirement but are also eligible for secondary accreditations which are voluntary (for example, a nursing program must be accredited by the NC Board of Nursing but can also be accredited by the National League of Nursing if a school wishes to acquire a secondary accreditation).

No new data were available for 1993-94.

VOLUNTARY ACCREDITATION OF CURRICULUMS, 1992-93

PROGRAM	NUMBER OF OFFERINGS	NUMBER ACCREDITED	% ACCREDITED
Architectural Technology (T041)	12	2	17
Associate Degree Nursing (T059)	36	7	19
Automation/Robotics Technology (T173)	2	1	50
Automotive Body Repair (V001)	24	0	0
Automotive Mechanics (V003)	35	0	0
Automotive Service Technician (T156)	11	3	27
Automotive Technology (T176)	18	1	6
Biomedical Equipment Technology (T158)	3	0	0
Biotechnology (T186)	1	0	0
Cardiovascular Sonography (T234)	1	1	100
Chemical Engineering Technology (T038)	1	1	100
Civil Engineering Technology (T038)	8	5	63
Computer Engineering Technology (T040)	11	1	9
Correctional & Juvenile Service (T102)	2	0	0
Criminal Justice (T129)	39	3	8
Cytotechnology (T232)	1	1	100
Dental Assisting (V011)	12	12	100
Dental Laboratory Technology (T055)	1	1	100
Drafting & Design Engineering Tech (T043)	19	2	11
Electrical Engineering Technology (T044)	5	1	20
Electromechanical Technology (T039)	5	0	0
Electronics Engineering Technology (T045)	40	8	20
Forest Management Technology (T007)	3	1	33
Funeral Service Education (T057)	2	2	100
Horticultural Technology (T009)	10	0	0
Industrial Engineering Technology (T047)	6	2	33
Instrumentation Technology (T048)	2	0	0
Juvenile Justice (T169)	0	0	0
Landscape Architecture Technology (T219)	1	0	0
Laser & Electro-Optics Technology (T200)*	1	0	0
Law Enforcement Technology (T064)	9	1	11
Manufacturing Engineering Technology (T050)	10	2	20
Mechanical Engineering Technology (T051)	8	2	25
Medical Assisting (T058)	12	7	58
Medical Assisting (V031)	9	5	56
Medical Laboratory Technology (T110)	11	10	91
Medical Sonography (T180)	3	3	100
Nuclear Medicine Technology (T104)	2	2	100
Paralegal Technology (T120)	19	3	16
Phlebotomy (V168)	14	14	100
Radiation Therapy (T221)	2	2	100
Radiologic Technology (T061)	15	15	100
Respiratory Care Technology (T091)	14	12	86
Surgical Technology (V071)	9	7	78
Surveying Technology (T125)	6	0	0
Tool Design Technology (T194)	1	0	0
Veterinary Medical Technology (T004)	1	1	100
TOTAL	457	141	31

Source: ***Programs Division, NC Community College System Office.***

Recommendation

An analysis of the costs and benefits of undergoing voluntary accreditation of curriculum programs should be conducted.

Published May 1995
North Carolina Community College System
750 copies of this document were printed at a cost of $967.50

Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer